



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Application No: 20250805

Location: 18 Clarendon Road, Gravesend, Kent, DA12 2BP

Description: Erection of single storey rear/side extension.

Applicant: Mr Jamal Miah

Site Visit: 2nd April 2026

Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application Form – dated 07 August 2025;
- Site Location Plan (scale – 1:1250);
- Drawing no. 18-08.B – Proposed Block Plan (scale – 1:200);
- Drawing no. 18-09 – Rev. A – Existing Block Plan (scale – 1:200);
- Drawing no.A100.C – Site Plan;
- Drawing no.A101.C– Ground Floor;
- Drawing no.A102.C– First Floor;
- Drawing no.A103.C– Loft;
- Drawing no.A104.C– Roof;
- Drawing no.A109.C – Front Elevation;
- Drawing no.A110.C – Rear Elevation;
- Drawing no.A111.C– Left Elevation;
- Drawing no.A112.C– Right Elevation;
- Drawing no.A113.C – 3D Front;
- Drawing no.A114.C – 3D Rear; and
- Drawing no.A115.C– Sections.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20220339	Proposed loft conversion with 2no. small dormers in the rear roof slope and conversion of the roof space to habitable rooms.	Permitted	10.06.2022

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014)

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

- CS20 – Heritage and the Historic Environment

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards

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 – Preserving 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)
- Riverside Conservation Area Appraisal
- Management Plan Gravesend Town Centre Conservation Areas (2009)

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended which states that, with respect to buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area

Emerging Local Plan as a Material Consideration

Paragraph 48 of the Framework makes it clear that planning applications can only be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. An emerging Local Plan, does not form part of the Development. The Framework, at Paragraph 49 allows local planning authorities to give weight to relevant policies in emerging Local Plans, according to:

- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the Framework, the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given to those policies.

West Oxfordshire District Council v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government & Rosconn Strategic Land Ltd [2018] EWHC 3065 (Admin) is a High Court judgement that deals with the weight to be given to a Regulation 19 Local Plan. In this judgement the Court found that the weight to be given to an emerging Local Plan, was a matter of planning judgement, which had to be reached having fully considered the relevant part (Paragraph 49) of the Framework.

The Council's emerging Local Plan, is in the process of being consulted upon (it has reached Regulation 19 stage), the Council is not yet aware of whether third parties will support or object to specific policies within the Plan, or whether they will consider the policies with the emerging Local Plan to be broadly sound and consistent with the NPPF (2024). Taking this into consideration, one can only conclude that at this stage of the process, **limited (i.e. minimal) weight should be afforded to the emerging Regulation 19 Local Plan**. This position would only change once the emerging Local Plan has progressed towards submission and examination, with the Council being fully aware of policies that are subject to unresolved objections and with knowledge of policies that have had their soundness and conformity against the Framework challenged.

This approach accords with the approach taken in a separate High Court case, Gladman Developments Ltd v SSHCLG & Corby Borough Council; & Uttlesford DC [2020] EWHC 518 (Admin) and Court of Appeal [2021] EWCA Civ 104, which was also the subject of a Court of Appeal Ruling [2021] EWCA Civ 104.

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

External Consultees

Port of London Authority

25 February 2026

There is no supporting information to explain the proposed changes but it would appear that the extension would extend across the whole width of the property boundary and that the property boundary does not extend to the PLA's site (i.e. there is a strip of land which will not be developed upon between 18 Clarendon Road and the PLA's site). If this is not the case then the PLA must be provided with the opportunity to provide further comments.

Whilst the use of the ground floor extension has changed the plans show that there would still be no openings (windows or doors) on the elevation that is closest to the PLA's property. The PLA is supportive of this design approach and would recommend that a condition prohibits any openings being placed on this elevation without consent in the future. This is because of the close proximity to the PLA's car park

20 August 2025

It would appear from the site plan that the extension would extend across the whole width of the property boundary and that the property boundary does not extend to the PLA's site (i.e. there is a strip of land which will not be developed upon between 18 Clarendon Road and the PLA's site).

Amongst other things a bedroom is proposed within the extension. The plans show that there would be no openings (windows or doors) on the elevation that is closest to the PLA's property (see the Applicant's left elevation drawing). The PLA is supportive of this design approach and would recommend that a condition prohibits any openings being placed on this elevation without consent in the future. This is because of the close proximity to the PLA's car park. On the basis of this condition being imposed on any grant of planning permission the PLA has no objection to application 20250805.

Internal Consultees

Local Ward Councillors – No comment received.

Neighbouring properties

A notice was displayed on site 26 September 2025.

In addition, three surrounding properties were consulted, four representations objecting to the proposal



were received in response. The comments received are summarised as follows:

Material Planning Considerations

- Loss of light
- Increased parking pressures
- Encroachment into shared alleyway

Non-Material Planning Considerations

- Matters controlled under building regulations
- Private issues between neighbours
- Loss of property value
- Loss of view
- Loss of access to shared alleyway
- Impact on utilities
- ASB

The consultation period expired 20 March 2026.

Officer's Analysis

Site Description

The application site consists of a two-storey end of terrace dwelling situated at the northern end of the terrace on the eastern side of Clarendon Road.



The property is located in the Riverside Conservation Area and an Area of Archaeological Potential.

Development Proposal

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear/side extension.

The proposed extension would have the following dimensions:

- Depth – 6.8m
- Width – 7.05m
- Height – 4m

Existing Elevations



Proposed Elevations



Design and Impact on the Conservation Area

Development Plan policy places considerable emphasis on the importance of achieving high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024) seeks to ensure that development will add to the quality of an area, be visually attractive, and sympathetic to local character and history. Policy CS19 (LPCS) reflects these aims and requires that new development is well designed and

respects the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The NPPF (2024) also places great significance on the desirability of sustaining and enhancing heritage assets, and on new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (paragraph 216). This is echoed in Policy CS20 (LPCS), which states that the significance of the Borough's heritage assets and their setting should always be preserved or enhanced. Saved Policy TC2 of the Local Plan First Review (LPFR) (1994) sets out that for development affecting the setting of listed buildings, the primary consideration is the maintenance of the integrity of the original listed building, and whether the character or appearance of the listed building will suffer as a result. Proposals must be sympathetic in terms of their appearance and materials.

Saved Policy TC3 (LPFR) also states that development is expected to make a positive contribution to the conservation area. As the application site lies within the Riverside Conservation Area, these policies are all relevant to the consideration of this application.

Whilst it is recognised that development which makes effective use of land should be supported (paragraph 124 of the NPPF (2024)), this comes with the proviso that it should safeguard and improve the environment and not conflict with other policies in the NPPF (2024). Relevant to this proposal, paragraph 129 of the NPPF (2024) which states that developments that makes efficient use of land should be supported, taking into account the identified need for different types of housing, the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting, and the importance of securing well-designed places.

Gravesham's Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide SPD (2021) sets out key design principles for extensions, which should reflect and respect the original character of the property and respond to its features and should be subservient and subordinate. The SPD continues to address single storey side extension, stating that they should appear subservient and should be no greater than half the width of the original building.

The proposed extension would be single storey, and would wrap around the original two storey rear out rigger. The side element of the extension would be setback 5.15m from the front elevation of the property, and would have a width of 2.7m, there would be a pitched roof over this element of the extension with an eaves height of 3m and a ridge height of 4m. The rear element of the extension would have a width of 7m, it would project 4m from the main rear elevation of the dwelling, it would be flat roofed with a height of 3m.

The width of the side extension would be greater than half the width of the original building (84%). Gravesham's Householder Design Guidance requires side extensions to be no more than half the width of the original dwellinghouse. In this instance, the large width of the side extension would dominate the modest end of terrace dwelling.

The extension would significantly increase the footprint of the dwelling, it would not be subservient or subordinate to the host dwelling. Despite the single storey nature of the extension, its large flat roof would be at odds with the character of the dwelling and would appear as a bulky addition, contrary to Gravesham's Householder Design Guidance (SPD), Policy CS19 (LPCS) and Section 12 of the NPPF (2024).

It is noted that due to the property's siting at the end of the cul-de-sac, the extension would not be overly visible from public vantage point, however it is not completely screened from view completely and would cause harm to the Conservation Area. The poor design and bulk of the extension fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area contrary to Policy CS20 and Section 16 of the NPPF (2024).

Overall, the proposed extension is poor design that is not subservient or subordinate to the scale of the property, and causes harm to the character of the host dwelling and the Riverside Conservation Area contrary to Gravesham's Householder Design Guidance (SPD), Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) as well as Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

Neighbouring Amenity

Policy CS19 (LPCS) seeks to protect amenity and ensure acceptable future living conditions. Section 12 of the NPPF (2024) also assists and seeks to ensure developments will function well, do not undermine quality of life and create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit and seeks to secure high-quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The proposed extension is not considered to have any significantly harmful impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. As the application property is located at the northern end of the terrace, it is unlikely impact through loss of light or overshadowing. Moreover, the extension is the same depth as the existing single storey projection to the rear of the outrigger, and although taller by virtue of the flat roof, it would not impact outlook or result in any sense of enclosure. There are no side windows proposed, and the windows proposed to the rear elevation would not result in any privacy issues. Therefore, the proposed extension safeguards neighbour amenity in accordance with Policy CS19 (LPCS) and Section 12 of the NPPF (2024).

Flood Risk

Parts of the application site are located within flood zones 2 and 3. As required by Policy CS18, the applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment in support of the application. The property's garden area is covered in hardstanding, the erection of the extension would not result in the loss of any permeable ground. As noted within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment a number of measures will be incorporated to mitigate flood risk, this includes no sleeping accommodation at ground level and no lowering of the existing floor levels. The FRA concludes that should the development be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in section 6 of the report the proposed development would be suitable in flood risk terms. It is considered that the sufficient mitigation measures have been incorporated into the proposal to ensure there is no increased flood risk or risk to occupiers. It is considered that the proposal would comply with Policy CS18 in this regard.

Parking and Highways

The application has been amended, and the originally proposed bedroom has been removed from the scheme, the development would not increase the total number of bedrooms at the property. Residents have raised concerns the proposal would increase local parking stress, whilst it is noted that on street parking is limited along Clarendon Road, there is no requirement to provide additional parking as there would be no increase in occupancy. In any case, the site is within a town centre location and is within walking distance of amenities. The proposed development is therefore considered compliant with policy P3 of the (LPFR), as well as Policies CS11 and CS19 (LPCS).

Conclusion

The application has been fully considered and is considered to result in harm to the character of the host property and the wider Riverside Conservation Area.

Recommendation

For detailed reasons for refusal and informatives, see draft Decision

Case Officer:	Mr Ade Lawal	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:	<i>Ade Lawal</i>	Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	17 th May 2026	Dated:	12 th May 2026

