



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2026

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 May 2026

Appeal Ref: 6005442

10 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 Mr and Mrs J. Cassidy against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 20251236.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of existing garage and erection of a two storey side/rear extension and a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and erection of a two storey side/rear extension and a single storey rear extension at 10 Court lodge, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent, DA12 3EQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20251236, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: 1000 Rev A, 1001 Rev A, 1010 Rev A, 1011 Rev A, 1013 Rev A, 1020 Rev B, 1030 Rev A, 1201 Rev A, 1210 Rev A, 1211 Rev A, 1213 Rev A, 1220 Rev A and 1230 Rev A.
 - 4) Any contamination that is found during the course of construction of the development hereby permitted that was not previously identified shall be reported immediately to the local planning authority. Development on the part of the site affected shall be suspended until a risk assessment has been carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Where unacceptable risks are found, the development shall not resume or continue until remediation and verification schemes have been carried out in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - 5) Notwithstanding the provisions of the town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enhancing that Order with or without modification), no window, door or other opening other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be form on the east and west flank walls of the extensions hereby permitted.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and the thereby the character and appearance of the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 10 Court Lodge (No 10) is a link detached two-storey dwellings located in a residential cul-de-sac. As I observed, properties in this part of Court Lodge are generally large and built on verdant spacious plots.
4. The appellants propose the demolition of the existing detached garage and the construction of a part single, part two-storey side/rear extension along with a single storey rear extension.
5. The Council found that the single storey rear/side extensions would in isolation be considered acceptable. From what I have seen and read I would concur with its findings on this part of the proposed development.
6. The proposed two-storey side extension would comprise a kitchen and store on the ground floor, together with a bedroom, dressing room and en-suite shower room at first floor level. The first floor rooms being formed within the new roof void. The extension when viewed from the street would have a half-hipped roof and hipped roofed dormer all to match the retained roof of the dwelling. However, the ridge line to the proposed extension would be set down so that the extension would appear as a later subservient addition. Although the extension would increase the overall size of the dwelling it would, as designed appear as a well-mannered addition.
7. The proposed dormer would match in size, three-dimensional form and detail the existing dormer on the eastern roof slope. Given the overall size of the roof as extended, the size and form of the dormer as well as its matching design I do not consider it to be so excessive in size as to render the extension a bulky or dominant addition as asserted by the Council.
8. A mono-pitched, cantilevered canopy is proposed to project about 1.6 metres or so to provide shelter to the store door. This is shown clipped on its western end. Although, given the way it is drawn it would appear as unusual I do not believe that it would in reality appear incongruous and therefore harmful to the appearance of the house as extended as suggested by the Council.
9. No 11 is set some distance in from the boundary to No 10 and much further back on its plot from the street. The proposed extension would meet the requirement set out in the Local Plan Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted October 2021) (SPD) that a minimum of 1.0 meters should be maintained between boundaries of adjoining properties. I acknowledge that development at second floor level within close proximity to shared boundaries can in some locations reduce the space in and around the dwellings, particularly in high-density built-up environments. This in turn can be detrimental to both the appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. However, as set out above in this case the property at No 11 is located both behind and some distance from the flank wall of No 10. I am therefore not persuaded that the proposed extension would in this case significantly reduce the visual space

between the dwellings or impact to any degree on the verdant character of the site or the surrounding rural area.

10. Overall, although the extension would increase the size of the dwelling it would, as designed appear as a well-mannered addition. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposal would not cause harm to architectural integrity of the host property or thereby the character and appearance of the wider area. It would therefore accord with the objectives of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Policy CS 19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (Adopted September 2014) and the SPD as they relate to, amongst other things making new development visually attractive so as to conserve and enhance the local built environment.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in light of the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In the interests of precision and enforceability, I have amended the Council's suggested wording where appropriate.
12. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
13. In order to safeguard the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring properties I will condition the formation of window, door or other openings in the flank elevations of the extensions permitted.
14. To prevent harm to human health and pollution of the environment I will require the appellants to undertake a watching brief in respect for any contamination encounter during construction.
15. In the interests of certainty, I shall however impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

16. Accordingly, for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR