



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20230552

Location: 88 Valley Drive Gravesend Kent DA12 5RX

Description: Demolition of existing garage and rear conservatory. Erection of single storey side/rear extension and a front porch with alteration to fenestration.

Applicant: Mr Muhammed Rob

Site Visit Date: Previous Site Visit

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application Form
Site Location Plan
1 – Proposed Ground Floor Plan
2 – Existing and Proposed Front and Rear Elevations
3 – Existing and Proposed Side Elevation
4 – Existing and Proposed Block Plan

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20230433	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed conversion of loft space to habitable rooms with a rear dormer, hipped to gable side roof extension and two skylights to the front roof slope.	Certificate Granted	14/06/2023
20221134	Demolition of existing garage and rear conservatory and erection of a two storey side, single storey rear extension and a front porch and alteration to fenestration.	Refused	21/02/2023
19960445	Erection of part first floor and part two storey side extension to form bedroom, enlarged bathroom and w.c. at first floor level with dining room and enlarged garage at ground floor level and erection of a conservatory at the rear.	Permitted	01/11/1996

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)

- T1 – Impact of Development on Highway Network
- 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)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

Ward Councillors: No comments received

GBC Highways Officer:

'I have no objections, there is adequate space for car parking on the driveway and there is no need for onsite turning as this section of Valley Drive is not classified.'

Neighbouring properties

The final date to submit comments was 21st June 2023.

10no. surrounding properties were consulted, and no comments were received from members of the public.

Officer's Analysis

Proposal

This application seeks planning consent to demolish the existing garage and rear conservatory. Then it would erect a single storey side extension and rear extension and a front porch, with alterations to the existing fenestration.

	Existing garage (m)	Existing Conservatory (m)
Max height	2.7	2.9
Max eaves height	N/A (Flat roof)	N/A (Flat roof)
Max Width	2.2	4.9

Max Depth	5.2	5.6 (3m beyond rear wall)
-----------	-----	---------------------------

	Proposed side extension (m)	Proposed rear extension (m)
Max height	3.4	3.4
Max eaves height	2.4	2.4
Max Width	2.1	7.65
Max Depth	10.4	5

This application follows a previous refusal under planning ref 20221134 for Demolition of existing garage and rear conservatory and erection of a two storey side, single storey rear extension and a front porch and alteration to fenestration.

The reasons for refusal of that application were as follows:

1. The proposed development by reason of its scale, proximity to the boundary, significant depth and poor design would result in significant harm to the character of this area and would as a result fail to comply with the requirements of the Householder Alterations/Extensions Guide, Policy CS19 (Development and Design Principles) of the Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) in terms of design, character and appearance.
2. By virtue of the excessive depth, height and proximity to the boundary the two storey side extension would result in harm to the living environments of future occupants of 90 Valley Drive. The extension would result in prominent level of bulk which would be overbearing and create an area of 'boxed in' enclosure. The proposal would therefore fail to provide a high standard of amenity for neighbouring's sites which conflicts with the requirements of Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
3. The proposed development by reason of its inability to demonstrate adequate level of vehicle on site vehicle and cycle parking provision, resulting in harmful impact to highway safety and failing to take opportunity to improve active travel accessibility, would as result be contrary to 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.

Given the similarities between the schemes, it would be important as part of this application, to assess whether this alternative proposal would overcome those reasons for refusal and that the scheme would be acceptable in terms of all other relevant planning policies. Where relevant, this assessment may reflect that made under planning reference 20221134 for consistency.

Principle of Development

This application is located inside the Urban Boundary, 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 and Parking Provision.

Design, Character and Appearance

This site is located in an urban, residential area. Although there are some terraced or bungalow properties in the area, the emphasis is on two storey semi-detached or detached dwellinghouses. This particular property is a semi-detached dwellinghouse. See photograph below:



It appears a majority of the buildings in this area are post WWII and although non-uniform in character, are generally representative of design and layouts built at that time.

The proposed side and rear extension would be single storey in height and set in from the front boundary by 0.9m and set in from the side by 0.2m. Overall the scale of side extension would not be significantly above that of the existing garage it would replace. The pitched roof and inset from the front elevation and boundary would be improvements from the existing side garage projection.

The proposed single storey rear extension would not be significantly larger than the existing rear conservatory and it would use a pitched roof which would soften the appearance. It would be a subservient addition. Concerns are raised with regard to the accuracy of the plans. However, given that the recommendation is to refuse, it would not be conducive to a favourable outcome to require the correction of this inaccurate representation of the rear extension. The proposed external materials are shown on the application as matching the existing.

It is considered that this scheme overcomes reason refusal 1.

On balance, the proposed development would fail to meet 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 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.

Given the non-uniform layout of dwellinghouse in the immediate vicinity, the curtilage of this site touches a number of dwellinghouses. The proposed works would be 29m from the rearmost boundary and so those neighbours which adjoin to the rear boundary would likely not be impacted by the proposals, given the distance. The rearmost boundaries of 4, 6, 8 and 10 Winchester Crescent touched the side boundary of the subject dwellinghouse. The proposed development would be 12.8 metres from the shared boundary with this neighbour, their dwellinghouses set further away than this. Again, therefore there is likely to be no significant impacts to these neighbours. Most likely to be impacted by the development would be 86 and 90 Valley Drive.

86 Valley Drive

This neighbour is located to the North and is attached. The proposed side extension would not be visible from this neighbour's perspective. However, there is potential that they would be impacted by the rear single storey element. There is an existing single storey rear extension and close boarded fencing at the shared boundary. The proposed extension is shown to be 1.8m deeper than the neighbours. However, given that it is a single storey addition, and the depth is not significant, it is unlikely that this would overbear on this neighbour significantly. There are also no concerns regarding increased overlook or overshadowing.

90 Valley Drive

This neighbour is located to the south. The subject dwellinghouse meets the shared boundary with this neighbour at single storey level. There is a distance between the buildings of 0.7m-0.9m at single storey height. The two-storey elements of the existing dwellinghouse are 2.9m from these neighbours building. The proposed development would a single storey side extension, 0.7m from the neighbours dwellinghouse. The depth of the extension close to this boundary at single storey height, would not be overbearing on this neighbour in terms of bulk, given the close proximity, height and depth.

This neighbours dwellinghouse is L Shaped and has ground and first floor windows to the side elevation and a first floor window facing forward which would not overshadowed by the single storey development. Please see photograph below:



There would be no new side windows resulting from the development. However, there would be removal of an existing side window as part of the development. This would result in a minor improvement to existing overlook of the neighbours property.

It is noted that the proposed extension would be single storey in height, it would not be greater in depth than this neighbour's rear elevation and at single storey, with close boarded fencing, would not overbear, overlook or overshadow this neighbour as a developmental element on its own.

This scheme would overcome refusal reason 2.

The proposal is therefore considered to not significantly harm the amenity of neighbouring properties in contravention of policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 and paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Parking Provision

The proposed development would not result in any increase in bedrooms. Given the lack of increased rooms, it is considered that the parking provision available would be acceptable. This would therefore overcome refusal reason 3.

Adequate vehicle and cycle parking provision has been demonstrated and as such the proposal in contravention 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 scheme overcomes all refusal reasons for recently refused alternative scheme under planning reference 20221134. The proposed development also 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)

Case Officer:	Ms Lisa Williams	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:		Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	3rd July 2023	Dated:	4th July 2023