



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2025

by **B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st December 2025

Appeal Ref: 6000880

109 Portland Avenue, Gravesend, Kent DA12 5HF

- 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 Caroline Hills against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 20250620.
- The development proposed is described as Proposed application for additional screening to decking.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 110 Portland Avenue, with particular reference to outlook and the perception of loss of privacy.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey terraced dwelling with a single-storey conservatory projecting from its rear elevation. There is a notable change in levels between the main house and rear garden and access to the patio outside the conservatory is via three external steps.
4. At present, the shared boundary with 110 Portland Avenue (No 110) is marked by a wood panel fence. As the proposed opaque glazed screening would be built atop this shared boundary its depth has the potential to impact the outlook for occupiers of the neighbouring property. Similarly, I have concerns with the height of the screening which, the submitted drawings confirm, would have a maximum height of 2.8m on the boundary with the neighbouring property.
5. No 110 has glazed doors on its rear elevation that appear to serve a habitable room. As these doors are situated only a short distance from the shared boundary, the proposed boundary screening would be prominently visible from within that room. The obscure glazed screen would extend approximately 3.1 metres beyond the rear of the appeal property's conservatory, which itself already projects noticeably beyond the rear elevation of No 110. Due to its height and substantial projection beyond No 110's rear elevation, the proposed screening atop the boundary fence would present an overbearing and visually intrusive feature when viewed both through the glazed doors and from the immediately adjoining garden area. The combined height, depth and proximity of the screening to the neighbouring habitable room would result in a significant sense of enclosure and a

consequent loss of outlook, thereby causing harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 110

6. No 110 already experiences a typical degree of mutual overlooking between neighbouring properties and their gardens, which is characteristic of residential areas of this nature. The proposed screening would consist of obscure glazing. Given its height and level of opacity, which could be secured by planning condition, I do not consider that the development would result in an unacceptable perception of overlooking for the occupiers of No 110.
7. Given its height and glazed material, which would allow some light to pass through it, the proposal would be unlikely to result in a harmful loss of natural light to the neighbouring occupiers. Nevertheless, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 110 Portland Avenue, with particular reference to outlook. I therefore find that it would conflict with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014). Amongst other aspects, this seeks to protect the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. The proposal would also conflict with the principles of the Framework that seek good design which provides a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

8. Although no objections have been raised by neighbouring residents, this in itself does not demonstrate that the proposal accords with the development plan.
9. The proposal would be subservient to the main dwelling, and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The appellant indicates that the proposal would be constructed with sustainable materials. It has also been put to me that the proposal complies with various aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). For instance, in relation to making efficient use of land and encouraging good design. Be that as it may, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR