

Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20250349

Location: 49 Pelham Road Gravesend Kent DA11 0JA

Description: Demolition of existing rear extensions. Removal of external steps.
Erection of two storey rear extension and single storey side extension with roof lights. Creation of patio to rear.

Applicant: Ms R Baker

Site Visit Date: 30 May 2025

Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application form;
- Drawing no. D-01 – Site Location Plan & Block Plan As Existing;
- Drawing no. D-02 Rev. D – Floor Plans & Elevations As Existing;
- Drawing no. D-04 – Block Plan As Proposed;
- Drawing no. D-05 Rev. F – Floor Plans & Elevations As Proposed; and
- Design & Access & Heritage Statement.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20160753	Erection of a single storey rear and side extension including erection of turret feature on existing rear terrace.	Permitted	01.02.2017

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014)

- CS01 – Sustainable Development
- CS02 – Scale & Distribution of Development
- CS12 – Green Infrastructure
- CS19 – Development & Design Principles
- CS20 – Heritage and the Historic Environment

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards
- TC3 – Development Affecting Conservation Areas

Paragraph 34 of the NPPF (2024) 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 (2024), the Council will also seek to replace these.

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

- Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- Section 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places
- Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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)
- Gravesham Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021)
- Design for Gravesham – Design Code (2024)
- Pelham Road/The Avenue Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2009)
- Management Plan – Gravesend's 19th Century Suburban Conservation Areas (2009)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

No response from:

- GBC Conservation Officer

Neighbouring properties

14 surrounding properties were consulted plus site and press notices – overall consultation expiry date was 20.06.2025 – 4 responses received the comments of which can be summarised as follows:

- Block their natural light
- Overlook them
- Rooflights shine into them;
- Dirt and dust from the works
- Overshadowing & loss of light
- Would be overlooked by the winter garden
- The current roof terrace does not overlook them or allow them to see the occupiers, whereas the proposed would;
- Two storey extension would ruin the character of the property and have a visually overbearing impact;
- Extensive use of windows for the winter garden seems out of character with the existing building and too much of a modern look for this property;
- Rear of property needs to be more maintained;
- Impact natural light and privacy of neighbouring properties;
- Height, scale and close proximity of the extension would severely block sunlight to neighbouring properties and their gardens
- Extension would overlook living space causing a substantial loss of privacy, would be intrusive and distressing;
- Out of character with the area;
- Set precedent for inappropriate extensions;
- General untidy nature of front garden;
- Noise levels will increase.

Officer's Analysis

The application site consists of a three storey detached building situated on the western side of Pelham Road. The property is situated in the Pelham Road/The Avenue Conservation Area, an Area Of Archaeological Potential and historic landfill site buffer zones of Lennox Road and Campbell Road Pit.

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing rear extensions and external steps and erection of a part two storey, part single storey rear and side extension.

For ease of reference the existing and proposed elevations and floor plans are as follow:

Existing



Proposed



The principal considerations in the assessment of the application are:

- Design, Character and Appearance including Heritage
- Amenity of Future Occupiers
- Neighbouring Amenity
- Parking and Highways
- Archaeology

Design, Character and Appearance including Heritage

Policy CS20 (LPCS) states that the Council will accord a high priority towards the preservation, protection and enhancement of its heritage and historic environment as a non-renewable resource. Also, saved Policy TC3 (LPFR) expects development in a conservation area to make a positive contribution to it. Policy CS19 (LPCS) is a more general design policy and requires new development to conserve and enhance the character of the local built and historic environment and to integrate well with the surrounding local area.

The host dwelling is built in the high Victorian Gothic architectural style with a turret on the front corner.

The rear of the property has a mix of non-original additions including a flat roof single storey rear extension with balcony area above and a staircase. The proposal is to remove the existing single storey flat roofed rear extension and staircase and erect a part two, part single storey rear and side extension. The ground floor element would be 9.7m in depth and 9.5m in width. The first floor element would be 6.8m in depth and 6.7m in width. There would be a balcony beyond this for a depth of 2.7m and to the same width (6.7m) with 1.1m high balustrade. In the rear elevation there would be two sets of bi-fold doors with a stained glass window in between and at first floor this it would be all glazed. In the north-east flank elevation there would be three windows at first floor level and two in the south west flank elevation. The single storey side extension would have a sloping pitched roof behind a parapet with rooflights in roof.

A single storey rear and side extension was permitted under application ref. 20160753. This was as follows:



Negotiations took place to get a fully hipped roof instead of the gable wall which was originally proposed, in order for it to work with the character of the existing building and given that the extension was visible from Pelham Road; it was also requested that the extension replicate the eaves detail of the front porch.

With regards extensions, it is generally considered that they should accurately reflect the design of the main house and remain subservient and secondary in their appearance. The scale and proportions of the extension should be proportionate to that of the main house.

The currently proposed single storey side extension element does not follow the elements which were agreed in the 2016 approval and what the permitted scheme had. The extension would have a parapet wall feature which would dominate the extension, be an incongruous feature and out of keeping with the character of the dwelling. As the extension would be visible from the front of the dwelling there would also be a degree of harm caused to the character and appearance of the Pelham Road/The Avenue Conservation Area.

The two storey element would appear as an overly dominant and incongruous addition also. The pitch of the ridgeline would exceed the eaves level of the main host dwelling, the eaves level would extend out in front of the three storey element on the rear of the dwelling, the vast amount of glazing in the rear elevation is completely out of keeping with the fenestration in the main dwelling which is sliding sash windows as the predominant type. The windows in both flank elevation with rounded heads are also out of keeping with the main sash windows which are straight headed. The juxtaposition of pitched roof, flat roof and parapet elements for all the different roof forms of the extension makes up for a varied roof form at the rear and side of the dwelling which again adds to the harmful appearance of the extension.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed part two storey, part single storey rear and side extension would by virtue of its scale and design be an overly dominant, incongruous addition which would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would not preserve the character or appearance of the Pelham Road/The Avenue Conservation Area. As such the proposal in respect of design, character and appearance including heritage is not compliant with Policies CS19 and CS20 (LPCS), saved Policy TC3 (LPFR) and sections 12 & 16 of the NPPF (2024).

Occupier Amenity

The private rear garden area after the proposal would be 416 sq. m and the rear garden depth would be 32m. This would exceed the minimum standards for a dwelling with four or more bedrooms and therefore the proposal would provide sufficient amenity space for the dwelling. The proposal in respect of occupier amenity is therefore compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Neighbouring Amenity

The two adjacent properties are no. 47 Pelham Road to the north east and no. 51 Pelham Road to the south west.

With regards no. 47, this property has a number of windows in its flank elevation at ground floor and first floor levels facing onto the application site;



The property is situated some 2.7m from the boundary line. The proposed single storey element would be built up to the boundary line. However, given that the extension is only single storey in height with a roof

that would slope away from no. 47, it is considered it would not cause any overshadowing or loss of light to the ground floor windows in the flank of no. 47. There are no windows proposed in the flank elevation of the extension at ground floor level so there would be no overlooking. The flank wall of the first floor rear extension would be 5.5m from the first floor windows in the flank elevation of no. 47. Given this distance and the height of the extension (to a height of 8.5m to the top of the ridgeline), it is considered that the extension would cause an overbearing impact on the windows in the flank elevation of no. 47 at both ground and first floor levels and would generally be an unneighbourly addition. The three windows in the north east flank elevation of the extension at first floor level serving the winter garden would overlook the windows in the flank elevation of no. 47 which would be harmful to the privacy of occupants of those rooms. The windows in the north-west flank elevation at first floor level particularly the rear most one would overlook the windows in the flank elevation of no. 51.

Furthermore, the balcony proposed on the end of the first floor rear extension would give rise to overlooking to both nos. 47 & 51 with views of the windows in the flank elevations of those dwellings and the rear garden areas. Although there is a current balcony area on top of the flat roof of the single storey rear extension, there is no record of planning permission being granted for this. It is therefore not considered to justify the proposal for a new balcony or the winter garden which would be in place of the existing terrace area.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed part two storey, part single storey rear and side extension would by virtue of its siting, scale and design cause overlooking, overbearing and would generally be an unneighbourly form of development to nos. 47 and 51 Pelham Road harmful to the amenity and privacy of those neighbouring dwellings. As such, the proposal in respect of neighbouring amenity is contrary to Policy CS19 (LPCS) and paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF (2024).

Parking and Highways

The proposal would not add any additional bedrooms or affect the existing parking at the property, as such the proposal would not have any impact on parking or highway safety. In respect of these matters the proposal is therefore compliant with saved Policy P3 (LPFR).

Other Matters

Archaeology

The application site lies in an Area Of Archaeological Potential. In the previous application ref. 20160753 KCC Heritage asked for a condition to be attached to request a programme for archaeological work given that the site lies 50m north of the former site of St Mary's Church. Subject to this condition if permission is forthcoming, then the proposal in respect of archaeology would be acceptable and compliant with saved Policy TC7 (LPFR).

Land contamination

It is also considered that given the site is situated in the historic landfill site buffer zones of Lennox Road and Campbell Road Pit, a watching brief condition on land contamination would need to be attached should permission be forthcoming. Subject to this the proposal in respect of land contamination would be compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Conclusion

The proposal (subject to conditions in some cases) would be acceptable in respect of occupier amenity, parking and highways, archaeology and land contamination. However, it is considered unacceptable in respect of design, character and appearance including heritage and neighbouring amenity.

Recommendation

Refusal

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

Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison	Team Leader:	Mrs Faye Walsh
Signed:		Signed:	
Dated:	26th June 2025	Dated:	27 June 2025