

# Delegated Report

## *Householder Planning Application*

---

**Planning Application No:** 20220966

**Location:** Trelowarren Norwood Lane Meopham Gravesend

**Description:** Erection of a two storey side and rear extension and a front porch.  
Replacement of existing tile hanging with render; replacement fences, walls, gate and a hardstanding to front garden.

**Applicant:** Mr Philpot

**Site Visit Date:** 26 October 2022

---

### Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application form;
- Drawing no. SM371.Site Rev. A – Site plans;
- Drawing no. SM371.1 – Existing plans;
- Drawing no. SM371.3 Rev. B – Proposed plans.

### Relevant Planning History

None.

### 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
- TC7 – Other Archaeological Sites

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
- 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

#### 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

##### Meopham Parish Council

No objection.

#### Neighbouring properties

5 surrounding properties were consulted with an overall consultation expiry date of 26 September – no responses received.

### **Officer's Analysis**

The application site consists of a two storey detached dwelling situated on the southern side of Norwood Lane. The site is located in Hook Green which is a Rural Settlement Inset from the Green Belt, within Meopham Downs Landscape Character Area and an Area of Archaeological Potential. The proposal is for a two storey side and rear extension, front porch, replacement of existing tile hanging with render; replacement fences, walls, gate and a hardstanding to front garden.

The principle considerations in the assessment of the application are:

- Principle
- Design, Character and Appearance
- Landscape Character
- Amenity of Occupiers
- Neighbouring Amenity
- Parking and Highway Safety

#### Principle

Policy CS02 (LPCS) states that in the rural area, development will be supported within those rural settlements inset from the Green Belt and defined in the Policies Map. This is a proposal for extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling in the Rural Settlement Inset from the Green Belt of Hook Green and as such the proposed development is acceptable in terms of principle. The proposal would also need to meet all other of the other principle considerations as discussed below.

#### Design, Character and Appearance

##### *Two storey side and rear extension*

The application site consists of a detached two storey dwelling with a pitched roof including a cat slide roof on the western roof slope and an attached garage. The side extension element which would be above the existing catslide roof would extend 3m in depth and the rear extension element would extend a further 4m in depth so that on the western elevation the overall depth of the extension would be 7m. From the eastern side the extension would just be the rear element of 4m in depth. The overall width of the extension would be 8.3m in width. Whilst large the property occupies a spacious plot and the extension would not increase the width of the dwelling as the side element would be over the existing catslide roof element; the side element would also be subservient in being set well back from the front elevation (by some 3.8m). The rear extension element is fairly deep at 4m but given the existing depth of the dwelling is 7m, this depth would be subservient in the context of the host dwelling itself and there is a large rear garden therefore the extension would not be an overdevelopment of the plot or the dwelling. The roof of the extension would be the same as that of the host dwelling and replicate its design. The fenestration would also match that of the main dwelling in terms of size and style. It would be faced with brick at ground floor to match the existing dwelling and render at first floor level (which it is proposed to face the whole of the dwelling with at first floor in place of the existing tile hanging) with matching roof tiles. It is not considered necessary to condition the colour of the render as the proposed rendering of the existing dwelling does not require the benefit of planning permission and so the rendering of the extension to match this would not require a condition for details of its colour.

Overall it is considered that the proposed two storey side and rear extension would be in keeping with the scale and character of the host and would have no impact on the streetscene.

#### *Front porch*

The porch would be an open structure with canopy supported on two posts and constructed of oak. It is acceptable in respect of scale and appearance to the main host dwelling and streetscene.

#### *Replacement of existing tile hanging with render*

There is a mixture of facing materials to the dwellings in this part of Norwood Lane with examples of render therefore, the replacement of the existing tiles at first floor level with render is considered acceptable in respect of the character of the house and the streetscene; it does not require the benefit of planning permission in any case and could be carried out under permitted development and as such a condition regarding its colour is not considered to be necessary.

#### *Replacement fences, walls, gate and a hardstanding to front garden*

A new brick boundary wall is proposed across the front elevation which would be 0.9m in height and have 1.2m high brick piers with a central timber vehicular access gates and a pedestrian gate. It appears sympathetically designed; the applicant could build a wall without the benefit of planning permission up to 1m in height and so given this and that the property is not a designated heritage asset, samples of the brick to be used as not considered necessary.

The fence along the side boundaries would be 1.2m in height which is considered low level and acceptable

The existing area of hardstanding in the front garden is to be extended but there would still be grassed areas in the front garden and so a soft landscaped appearance of the frontage would still be maintained; it would be permeable and as such could be carried out under permitted development in any case.

Overall, in respect of design, character and appearance the proposal is considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

#### 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 Occupiers

The property would increase from a four to a five bedroom dwelling. SPG2 states that for a property with four or more bedrooms there should be a minimum garden area of 100 sq. m and a minimum garden depth of 10m. In this case with the proposal there would be a garden area of 379 sq. m and rear garden depth of some 20m and as such the minimum standards would be far exceeded. In terms of the bedrooms proposed, nos. 2 and the master bedroom are both shown as doubles. The Technical Housing Standards state that double bedrooms should be a minimum of 11.5 sq. m. In this case bedroom 2 would be 10 sq. m and so slightly under the minimum standard but the existing bedroom 2 is the same size and so on this occasion it is not considered that this is unacceptable as it is the same as existing and not any worse than the existing situation. The master bedroom would be 14 sq. m and so far exceeds the minimum standard.

In respect of the amenity of occupiers the proposal is therefore considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

#### Neighbouring Amenity

The extension would be located on the western side and part of the rear south elevation of the dwelling. The property to the west is Hilton House which has windows in its east flank elevation. Due to the distance of the west elevation of the proposed extension from the east elevation of Hilton House, some 7.4m, there would be no impact on the windows in the east flank elevation of Hilton House in respect of overshadowing or loss of outlook. In the original plans submitted there were two first floor level bedroom windows proposed in the west flank elevation of the proposed extension. Although they were shown to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7m above floor level, the windows were still considered unacceptable due to the perception of overlooking which occupiers of Hilton House would experience from them and so the agent was asked to remove them from the plans which has been done. The only window which would be in the west flank elevation at first floor level would serve an en-suite which is a non-habitable room and the window would be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7m above floor level with the part above this being openable and clear glazed so no impact on Hilton House with regards overlooking.

Due to the proposed extension being located on the western side and part of the rear elevation its nearest part would be some 12m from the property to the east Nursery Cottage and therefore no impact on this property with regards overshadowing or loss of outlook. There is a bathroom window proposed at first floor level in the east elevation of the extension but as a non-habitable room and as it would be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7m above floor level with the part above being openable and clear glazed it is considered there are no issues regarding overlooking to Nursery Cottage. It is recommended a condition is attached to state no other openings shall be installed in either flank elevation of the extension.

There would be a distance of some 31m from the rear elevation of the extension to the nearest dwelling to the rear 'Irashai' and therefore no impact on this property with regards overshadowing, loss of outlook or overlooking.

In respect of neighbour amenity the proposal is therefore considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

#### Parking and Highway Safety

The property would increase from a four to a five bedroom dwelling. SPG4 states that for a property with four or more bedrooms there should be a maximum of three spaces per dwelling. The existing hardstanding area in the front garden achieve this and it is proposed to increase the area of hardstanding which is to be permeable construction therefore, it is considered there would be sufficient off-street parking

provision for the proposal. In this respect the proposal is compliant with saved Policy P3 (LPFR).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

None.

**Conclusion & Recommendation**

The proposal is considered acceptable with regards principle, design, character and appearance, landscape character, amenity of occupiers, amenity of neighbouring properties (following receipt of the revised plans) and parking and highway safety.

**Recommendation:** Permission

(For detailed conditions and informatives, see draft Decision)

|                      |                         |                     |                                     |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Case Officer:</b> | Ms Rebecca Harrison     | <b>Team Leader:</b> | <b>Richard Hart</b>                 |
| <b>Signed:</b>       | <i>Rebecca Harrison</i> | <b>Signed:</b>      | <i>R Hart</i>                       |
| <b>Dated:</b>        | 27th October 2022       | <b>Dated:</b>       | <b>28<sup>th</sup> October 2022</b> |