



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20230558

Location: 1 Willow Walk Meopham Gravesend Kent

Description: Demolition of existing detached garage and rear projection, erection of first floor extension to bungalow, single storey rear extension and side extensions incorporating garage to either side and alterations to fenestration.

Applicant: Mr Palvinder Philora

Site Visit Date: Previous Visit

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application Form
3429-003 – Site Plan
3429-006 – Existing Plans and Elevations
3429-007 – Proposed Plans and Elevations
Cover Letter

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20221122	Demolition of existing detached garage and rear projection, erection of first floor extension to bungalow, single storey rear extension and side extensions incorporating garage to either side and alterations to fenestration.	Refused	29.11.2022
20030919	Erection of single storey extension to the northern side elevation to form double garage and enlarged dining room and a conservatory at the rear and construction of a new vehicular access.	Permitted	16.12.2003

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

- CS01 – Sustainable Development
- CS02 – Scale & Distribution of Development
- CS11 – Transport
- CS12 – Green Infrastructure
- CS18 – Climate Change
- CS19 - Development & Design Principles

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards

- T1 - Impact of Development on Highway Network
-

Paragraph 33 of the NPPF (2021) sets out that policies within adopted local plans should be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every five years, and should then be updated as necessary. Such reviews are also a legal requirement as set out in Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) England Regulations 2012.

The Council undertook such a review in September 2019 and found that the adopted Local Plan Core Strategy is in need of a partial review in terms of Policy CS02, due to the increased need for housing since the Local Plan Core Strategy was adopted and the need to ensure that a sufficient land supply exists to meet this need. Whilst saved policies from the Local Plan 1st Review (1994) generally conform with the NPPF (2021), the Council will also seek to replace these.

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

- 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- 12 – Achieving sustainable development and well-designed places

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- 2 - Residential layout guidelines including Housing Standards Policy Statement October 2015 Adopted 1996 – amended June 2020;
- Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard (2015);
- SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006);
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021); and
- Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment (2009)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

Ward Councillors

‘Meopham Parish Council object to this planning application on the grounds of excessive bulk relative to the size of the plot and inappropriate to the street scene.’

Dickens Protection Society

No comments received.

Neighbouring properties

The final date to submit comments ended on 3rd July 2023.

3 surrounding properties were consulted, and no comments were received from members of the public.

Officer’s Analysis

Principle of Development

This application is located inside a Rural Settlement inset from the Greenbelt (Culverstone Green), where alterations and extensions to residential buildings are generally acceptable in principle as per Policy CS02: Scale and Distribution of Development.

However, all other relevant matters should be considered. In this instance, the main points to consider would be the potential impact on; Visual Amenity (Design, Character and Appearance), Amenity of Future Occupiers, Residential Amenity of neighbours, Landscape Character Area and Parking Provision.

It is noted that this scheme follows recently refused scheme under planning reference 20221122 for;
‘Demolition of existing detached garage and rear projection, erection of first floor extension to bungalow,

single storey rear extension and side extensions incorporating garage to either side and alterations to fenestration.'

Given the similarities between that refused scheme and this one proposed it would be necessary to consider whether the refusal reason for that scheme would be overcome by the alterations in this proposal. However, where relevant for consistency, the assessment made here may reflect that of the previous report.

The refusal reason for planning reference 20221122 was:

- 1. The proposed development would result in extensions and alterations disproportionately over and above the existing dwellinghouse, in a manner uncharacteristic of the rural character of this residential settlement and in a prominent position which would have significant impact to the areas character and street scene. This would be contrary to the requirements of Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021) in terms of design, character and appearance.*

Design, Character and Appearance

This particular property holds greater prominence to the street scene than others, given its corner location on Willow Walk and Wrotham Road Street (A227). It is also noted that although not a deep dwellinghouse, it is a spacious dwelling as a result of its wide frontage which, again gives it a greater prominence and impact to the character of the area. Prior to the works undertaken following approval in 2003, the dwellinghouse was relatively unchanged. Those works result in enlargement to the north side elevation and rear.



Having undertaken a site visit it is evident that the existing dwellinghouses nearby in the immediate vicinity on both Wrotham Road and Willow Walk are generally bungalows. Where there are first floors, these are generally serviced by roof dormers rather than extending the exterior walls vertically. This use of dormers to provide additional space is an appropriate measure for an area such as this with a mixed residential/rural character. There are some exceptions to this where there are two storey elevations visible from the front. For instance, Dorman's Cottage, located on Wrotham Road 110 metres north of the subject dwellinghouse. Dorman's Cottage, forms part of a cluster of dwellinghouses on South Street originally built between 1940 and 1960. The subject dwellinghouse is a later addition along with other neighbouring properties on Willow Walk and appears on the historic maps between 1960 and 1990. There are other two-storey dwellinghouses to the south end of this property on Wrotham Road and some newer built dwellinghouses

two-storey in nature to the southeast, at the end of Willow Walk. Having assessed the character in terms of building heights, to summarise; it is evident that most are bungalows, some with dormer roof conversions. There are exceptions which are two storeys. However, the two storey dwellinghouses in the wider area are set further back, less prominent in their location and generally do not have as wide of a frontage as the subject dwellinghouse.

In the delegated report for planning reference 20221122 the assessment stated:

'It is the prominent position and wide frontage which would make the first-floor extension of this dwellinghouse unusually prominent, bulky and overbearing. This overdevelopment of this dwellinghouse, when considering the large side extension and rear single storey extension already completed previously, would be significantly over and above the scale of the original building, eclipsing the original scale of the dwellinghouse in a manner which would be uncharacteristic for this residential area which is a rural settlement with a mixed residential and rural appearance. A two-storey dwellinghouse in this location in principle would not be objectionable in itself as there is some character of two-storey dwellinghouses. The issue here is that the extension would result in overbearing and prominent bulk and would not be subservient. Given the existing, position layout and width of the dwellinghouse, it is unlikely that this would easily be resolved by extending the dwellinghouse.'

For clarity elevations of the previous scheme and the new scheme are shown below (Not to Scale):



Elevations Refused under planning reference 20221122



Proposed Scheme

As can be seen, there have been some minor changes from that application previously refused. These are:

- Removal of garages to either side.
- Altered sizes to front gables at either side to match.
- Addition of gables to rear elevation.
- Eave height lowered by 0.5m
- Central gable reduced to a single storey porch.
- Addition of rooflights to front and rear.
- Use of render finish on front gables.

It is undeniable that these changes, particularly from the front elevation result in a less bulky and less cluttered appearance. However, taking into context, the position, width and prominence of the building alongside with the wider character of the area, of low form dwellinghouses, it is considered that the dwellinghouse would result in extensions and alterations disproportionally over and above the existing dwellinghouse, in a manner uncharacteristic of the rural character of this residential settlement and in a prominent position which would have significant impact to the areas character and street scene. As such this proposal would not overcome the previous reason for refusal. Again, it is reiterated that a two-storey dwellinghouse in this location in principle is not objectionable. However, given the existing context of the building, it would be difficult to achieve this without a rebuild of the dwellinghouse, where opportunities to reduce the width, create appropriate setback and utilise a more appropriate roof form, similar to the neighbouring properties (Marycroft and Collina), shown on the elevations above and in the images below.



Marycroft



Collina

On balance, as a result of the significant scale and prominent bulk; the proposed development would not comply with the requirements of Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021) in terms of design, character and appearance.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

The NPPF (2021) states that planning decisions should aim to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users. The impact on amenity is also considered with regard to the criteria with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy, which states that new development should be located, designed and constructed to safeguard the amenity, including privacy, daylight and sunlight, of its occupants, and those of neighbouring properties and land. The impact on neighbours will be assessed in the next section of the report.

The existing dwellinghouse contains three bedrooms. The proposed extensions and alterations would result in five bedrooms at first floor with four ensuites and a bathroom on first floor and a reception room, lounge, dining room, family room, study, bathroom and kitchen at ground floor.

The rooms meet the required minimum space standards and would continue to have adequate rear garden depth and area as per SPG2 - Residential layout guidelines including Housing Standards Policy Statement October 2015 Adopted 1996 – amended June 2020.

Neighbouring Amenity

As outlined above, it is important that any development safeguards the amenity of neighbouring properties and land. Following a period of consultation with neighbouring properties, no objection to the proposal was received.

This dwellinghouse given its corner plot is set forward of both adjoining neighbours. There would be no new upper floor side openings, thus preventing direct overlook. The depth of the dwellinghouse would not increase with the addition of the first floor. The single storey rear extension would be set in from one side and would not be of significant height or depth. On balance, largely due to the retention of the small depth of the dwellinghouse, the positioning, scale and inset from the shared side boundaries and the lack of upper floor side openings, the development would not significantly harm the amenity of residential neighbours.

The proposal is therefore considered to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring properties in compliance with policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014.

Landscape Character Area

The proposal is for extensions and alterations to an existing property which is located in a built up rural

settlement inset from the Green Belt. Although the proposed development would increase the size of the property, it would still retain as a very open site due to the size of the plot and the surrounding garden and as such the proposed development would not be detrimental to the open, rural landscape character of the surrounding area.

In respect of landscape character, the proposal is therefore considered compliant with Policy CS12 (LPCS).

Parking Provision

The existing number of bedrooms are three and this would increase to five as a result of the proposed development.

The proposal would remove the existing detached single bay garage. The retained front drives would be capable of accommodating 3-4 vehicles.

The proposed parking provision requirement as per the SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006); would be 3 vehicle spaces and 2 cycle spaces. Given that the proposed alterations would allow for parking of 3-4 vehicles in total, it is considered it would be capable of accommodating 3 vehicles and 2 cycle spaces.

Adequate parking provision would therefore be made available, in compliance with policies T1 and P3 of the Local Plan First Review 1994 and Policies CS11 and CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposed development would result in extensions and alterations disproportionally over and above the existing dwellinghouse, in a manner uncharacteristic of the rural character of this residential settlement and in a prominent position which would have significant impact to the areas character and street scene. This would be contrary to the requirements of Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021) in terms of design, character and appearance.

In this instance, it is unlikely that minor amendments to the scheme would overcome this issue and so it was not considered to be conducive to a favourable outcome to enter into discussions regarding potential alterations to the scheme prior to decision. The applicant and agent may wish to seek further pre-application advice prior to submission of an alternative proposal which this Local Planning Authority would welcome.

(For detailed conditions / reasons for refusal and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Ms Lisa Williams	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:		Signed:	
Dated:	13th July 2023	Dated:	14 th July 2023