



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2026

By Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6010596

1 Willow Walk, Meopham DA13 0QS

- 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 Palvinder Philora against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 20260211
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "Proposed detached garage to replace existing carport and simplified front elevation with revised front entrance".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the streetscene and the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a detached bungalow located at the corner of Willow Walk and the A227 South Street. Properties in the vicinity on the same side of these streets are generally single storey below eaves level. There are examples of front projections, but these tend to be only single storey in height. In consequence, the proposed two storey feature would be particularly unusual. Moreover, there would only be a somewhat minimal gap to the ridge above. The fairly extensive glazing would also tend to draw further attention to its presence. In these circumstances rather than being subservient and resulting in a more coherent and simplified front elevation, it would be a visually intrusive and overly dominant presence in the streetscene.
4. The proposed garage would replace an existing car port that is seen above a fence when looking from the street. This comprises a canopy supported by posts. However, the new garage would have a noticeably more solid appearance being enclosed by walls with roof slopes above rising to a triangular shaped flat top. In consequence, it would be an appreciably more emphatic presence in the street. The outbuilding would have a somewhat unusual broadly triangular footprint and form while also being particularly close to the side boundary. Despite reflecting the tapering boundary and making provision for car parking and storage, this would give rise to an unduly cramped and contrived appearance.
5. The adverse effects I have found would occur at a particularly prominent corner location, accentuated by the width of the host dwelling and projection forward of the

dwelling at Marycroft. This prominence would be unduly increased by the front projection and garage.

6. The existing planning permission at the appeal site only includes a single storey projection and does not include a garage as now proposed. The current proposal can therefore be clearly distinguished from the approved scheme which consequently provides no significant support for the appeal.
7. For the above reasons it is concluded that the streetscene and the character and appearance of the locality would be harmed. The failure to be visually attractive and conserve the character of the built environment would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS19.
8. In the National Planning Policy Framework, it is indicated that decisions should ensure that developments satisfy a number of considerations. These include that the proposed development should be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character, which would not be achieved in this case.
9. I acknowledge the previous appeal decisions at this site, but I have considered this appeal on its own merits. This is a case where harm would arise and there would be conflict with the development plan. Moreover, there are no other considerations that would justify making a decision other than in accordance with the development plan and the appeal is dismissed.

M Evans

INSPECTOR