



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2024

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/24/3338743

18 Peach Croft, Northfleet, Gravesend, Kent DA11 8ST

- 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 D and K Partridge & J and C Cassidy against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20231200, dated 27 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and single-storey rear extensions, and associated external and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues raised by this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the standards of living environment for its future occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 4 "Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021)" requires extensions to dwellings to be subordinate to that of the host dwelling. To achieve this the Guide illustrates that the extension is to be stepped back from the front building line of the original dwelling and roofs are to be stepped down from the ridge of the host dwelling.
4. The proposed side extension, having a matching front building line and roof ridge to that of the host property, would not satisfy the requirements of the Guide. As such, the extension would not be a subservient addition to the host dwelling, as required by SPD 4.
5. The Guide also requires the width of an extension to be no greater than the width of the host building. The side extension would be almost the same width as the original dwelling.
6. Taking these matters collectively, the proposal would not be a subservient addition to the host dwelling. Furthermore, given its overall size, it would have

an appearance of an additional dwelling attached to the host property, rather than appearing as an extension to the existing dwelling house.

7. The rear extension would span across both the rear of the original dwelling and that of the side extension. When considered in conjunction with the two storey side extension the Council have calculated that the proposed extensions would add an additional 55.69sqm to the original 33.96sqm footprint of the original dwelling. This would not respect the scale of the host dwelling.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policy CS19 of the Local Plan Core Strategy 2014, SPD 4 and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) 2023. This policy, SPD 4 and the Framework seek, amongst other matters, development to be visually attractive, conserve and enhance the character of the local built environment and to integrate well with the surrounding local area.
9. No.14 Peach Croft hosts a two-storey side extension that extends along the principal frontage elevation of that property. I have been provided various documents and details relating to planning permissions at No.14 from between September 1987 up until December 2008. Photographs of No.14 as it is now have also been provided. It is also suggested that the proposed rear extension is wholly consistent with, and less substantial than, the rear extensions granted planning permission to Nos 14 and 15 Peach Croft. Planning details relating to a planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension at No.15 have also been provided.
10. Those planning permissions relating to No.14 predate the 2014 Local Plan Core Strategy, and all those planning permissions predate the 2021 SPD and the 2023 Framework. The proposal can and should be considered against the current development plan and guidance that is in place.
11. An extension could be provided under Permitted Development rights, albeit the existence of permitted development does not make the development more acceptable, nor does it justify the harm that I have identified above.

Living environment

12. The Council has adopted residential layout guidelines for garden sizes and depths (SPG 2 "Residential Layout Guidelines (June 2020)"). Post development the Council have calculated that the rear garden area would be of a size approximately 36.51sqm and have a maximum depth of around 3.07m, which is said to be significantly below the Council's minimum standards for residential gardens.
13. The appellant contends that the correct figures for the rear garden are 103sqm (area) and 10.15m (depth) and comments that the proposed rear extension would maintain a minimum 100sqm rear garden area and 10m depth as sought for new 4-bed residential dwellings in accordance with the Council's SPG 2. Looking at the proposed site block plan, drawing reference 1101, which has been included within the Council's delegated report, that plan annotates the garden area to be 103sqm and to be 10.15m deep post rear extension. It, therefore, appears to me that the resulting size of the rear garden would accord with the Council's adopted SPD 2.

14. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the standards of living environment for its future occupiers. The proposal would, therefore, not conflict with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014, SPG 2 (2020), and paragraph 135f of the Framework 2023.

Conclusion

15. Whilst I have found in favour of the appellant in terms of the second main issue, this does not overcome the identified harm in relation to the first main issue.
16. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR