



# Delegated Report

## Householder Planning Application

**Planning Application No:** 20230394

**Location:** Hartland House Sole Street Cobham Gravesend

**Description:** Demolition of existing conservatory with erection of first floor front extension, single storey front extension and two storey side extension.

**Applicant:** Mrs Edith Holland

**Site Visit Date:** 31st May 2023

### Submitted Documents/Plans

Application Form

01 – Plans and Elevations as Existing

02 – Plans and Elevations as Proposed

03 – Site Location Plan

04 – Block Plans as Existing and Proposed

### Relevant Planning History

| Reference | Description                                                               | Decision  | Decision Date |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| 19860262  | Erection of single storey front extension to form utility room            | Permitted | 06.05.1986    |
| 19830440  | Erection of single storey side extension to form double garage and apiary | Permitted | 16.08.1983    |

### Development Plan

#### Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

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

#### Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards

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)

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

#### Supplementary Planning Guidance

- SPG 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: No response received.

Cobham Parish Council: No response received.

#### Neighbouring properties

A site notice was also displayed on 03/05/23. 4no. surrounding properties were consulted. The expiry date for submission of comments ended on 26/05/23.

No comments were received from members of the public.

### **Officer's Analysis**

#### Principle of Development

This application is located in a Rural Settlement Inset from the Green Belt, 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), Landscape Character Area, Amenity of Future Occupiers, Residential Amenity of neighbours and Parking and Highways.

#### Design, Character and Appearance

The proposed development would result in an increased footprint as a result of the front porch and the two-storey side extension. The first-floor front extension would be set above the lounge and whilst it would increase the bulk, it would not increase the footprint. The increase in footprint would be approximately 14m<sup>2</sup>. This is a minor increase to the existing footprint of 161.41m<sup>2</sup>. The footprint would be appropriately sized and reflective of other neighbouring properties. However, the size of the extensions is only partially determined by its increase in footprint.

In this instance the porch would be a small addition with a pitched roof. It would be subservient in scale and appearance.

The two storey extensions, given their increased volume and prominence have greater potential to be dominating and oppressive but this is dependent on the design. To the rear/side the two-storey extension would infill the corner and would not extend beyond the existing further rear or side elevation. Its pitch

would match the existing two-storey built form with a small flat roof, allowing for appropriate spacing and more practically maintenance space. Visually, its ridge would be lower than the main roof and it would retain the existing eave height. It would be subservient in appearance.

The first-floor front extension would be reflective of the existing front facing pitched projection. It would unfortunately reduce the existing symmetry of the building to the front. However, on balance the addition would be a minor increase not extending beyond the existing side or front elevations, with a low ridge, retaining the existing eave height and would be subservient in appearance.

It is noted that the application for describes the windows as upvc. However, upon the site visit, it was evident that the openings are timber with some having fallen into disrepair. See image below:



The applicant advised at the site visit that they would be using aluminium framed windows. However, the application form stated that the doors and windows would be UPVC.

The application form states that the building would use render to the upper façade and facing brickwork to the lower façade, and roof tiles. These materials are indicated as matching the existing dwellinghouse. Given the high-quality appearance of the buildings along this street and its location in the Meopham Downs Landscape Character Area, the appearance and quality of external materials are important to the result impact on visual amenity. Therefore, where approved a condition would be applied requiring further details of materials to be used externally.

On balance, the proposed development would 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, subject to condition.

### Landscape Character

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).

### 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 proposed development would create an enlarged bedroom, kitchen and porch. All new elements would comply with the minimum space standards in the adopted Residential Layout Guidelines (2020) and retain adequate external space as per the Guidelines.

### 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.

#### *Medway House*

This neighbour is located to the northeast. There is 4.9m between the dwellinghouses. The proposed extensions would not reduce the distance between the buildings. There is planting and hedging at the shared boundary with this neighbour, obscuring visibility between the plots. The proposed development would include a first floor side facing window which would serve an ensuite. Given the nature of the use of the room which the window would serve it would be reasonable to require the window to be obscured, to avoid overlooking issues with the neighbouring property. Given the distance and position of the proposed extensions no concerns are raised with regard to significant overshadowing of this neighbour's property.

#### *Harvest House*

This neighbour is located to the southwest. There is 2.3m between the dwellinghouses. The proposed extension near (The front first floor extension), would be 6.9m from this neighbours' elevations. At the boundary there is substantial planting and hedging which would restrict views of ground floor elements of the development. Given the distance and position of the proposed extensions no concerns are raised with regard to significant overshadowing of this neighbour's property. There would be a side window at first floor serving the bedroom. However, this would not overlook any rear private garden space and as the below image shows, there are no first-floor openings on this neighbour's side elevation which would directly face the proposed window.



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

#### Parking and Highways

The proposed scheme would not increase the number of bedrooms, in this 6-bedroom property. Nor would it reduce the parking provision available both within the garage and on the front drive. This scheme also does not propose alterations to the access.

Adequate vehicle and cycle parking provision is therefore available in accordance with paragraphs 110 to 113 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Saved Policies T1 and P3 of the Local Plan First Review (1994) and Policies CS11 and CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 subject to further details of cycle parking provision.

#### **Conclusion & Recommendation**

The proposed development complies with all relevant national and local planning policies. The recommendation is therefore to approve.

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

|                      |                                                                                     |                     |                                                                                       |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Case Officer:</b> | Ms Lisa Williams                                                                    | <b>Team Leader:</b> | Miss Faye Hobbs                                                                       |
| <b>Signed:</b>       |  | <b>Signed:</b>      |  |
| <b>Dated:</b>        | 6th June 2023                                                                       | <b>Dated:</b>       | 14 June 2023                                                                          |