



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20211149

Location: 22 Frobisher Way Gravesend Kent DA12 4RA

Description: Erection of single storey rear extension; erection of new front porch; and conversion of detached garage to provide domestic storage.

Applicant: Mrs Sutha Premroy

Site Visit Date: 12 January 2021

Submitted Documents/Plans

Householder Planning Application form;
Red line site boundary plan;
Existing block plan;
Proposed block plan;
Drawing no. PE1417 (13.01.22 amendment) Existing and proposed layout and elevations;
Drawing no. PE1417 B (received 26.11.21) Proposed parking layout;
Drawing no. PE1417 B (received 13.01.22) Proposed front elevation of garage; and
Emails from the agent dated 17 and 25 November 2021.

Procedural issues

The original application was described as the 'erection of a single storey rear extension and erection of a new front porch' but the submitted drawings illustrated works to convert an existing garage into habitable accommodation using permitted development rights and to join the garage to an enlarged rear extension. The case officer highlighted that the conversion of the garage required planning permission in itself and sought clarification regarding the exact nature of the works proposed (as it was not clear from the plans whether the existing rear extension and porch would be demolished and rebuilt or retained and altered). Following clarifications from the agent, the description was amended to 'erection of single storey rear extension; erection of new front porch; and conversion of detached garage into habitable accommodation' and amended drawings were submitted. In addition, proposed parking details were provided.

Following further requests for clarification from the case officer (regarding the nature of the proposed residential annex), the application was further amended to remove the proposed annex. The agent confirmed that the garage conversion was to provide domestic storage only. As such, the description of the proposed development was further amended to that set out above.

Relevant Planning History

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Decision</u>
19890512	Erection of single storey side extension to form shower room/w.c.	Permitted	05.09.1989

19830342	Single storey extension at the rear to form kitchen	Permitted	28.06.1983
19800253	Retention of a garage at the rear	Permitted	13.05.1980

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
- CS20 – Heritage and the Historic Environment

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P5 – Exceptions to Vehicle Parking Standards
- T1 – Impact of Development on Highway Network
- 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

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- 2 - Residential layout guidelines including Housing Standards Policy Statement October 2015 Adopted 1996 – amended June 2020;
- SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006)
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide SPD (2021)

Other documents

- Nationally Described Space Standard 2015

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

GBC - Highways Officer

I have no objections to the proposal. The front drive will have sufficient space for the parking of two vehicles (5m x 2.5m) on it and the entire front garden is already hard paved. The parking of a third vehicle is not possible due to the communal access arrangements with the neighbouring property. I would however recommend that the front drive should be directly accessed from the highway and not by the communal drive. This should simplify access and make it safer.

The applicant should also consider the installation of the cables to support a future electric vehicle charging point.

KCC – Heritage

The site lies within an area of multi-period archaeological potential, however, I consider it unlikely that the proposed works will have a significant archaeological impact and have no further comments to make in this case.

Neighbouring properties

The application was publicised by a site notice and to seven neighbouring properties by letter on two occasions (to reflect the first and second sets of amended details). Four representations have been received (two during the first round of publicity and two during the second) and are summarised as follows;

First round comments

- The GBC Website would not allow the application details to be accessed and therefore residents are not able to comment.
- The plans do not contain measurements so it is difficult to comment.
- Queries whether the existing rear extension would be removed and rebuilt or enlarged.
- There would appear to be a change of use of the garage to residential which should be clarified.
- Adverse impact of a garage conversion on the aspect from the landing window at no. 18 Frobisher Way.
- Loss of sunlight and overshadowing to the conservatory at no. 20 Frobisher Way.
- Overlooking to the proposed garage windows from no. 20 Frobisher Way.
- No objection to the proposed porch.

Second round comments

- Loss of sunlight and overshadowing to the conservatory at no. 20 Frobisher Way.
- Concerns regarding surface water drainage.
- Queries whether the garage would be converted into a dwelling.
- Overlooking from no. 20 Frobisher Way to the garage conversion as the boundary fence is only 1.2 metres tall.
- No objection to the proposed porch.
- The proposed parking layout would encroach over a shared driveway with no. 24 Frobisher Way and block access to its garage.
- Queries whether the existing rear extension would be removed and rebuilt or enlarged.
- The proposed extension would go beyond the permitted building line.
- Queries the lack of toilet facilities, a bedroom or direct access to the main house from the converted garage.
- Queries how the existing garage can be converted when it is constructed from pre-cast concrete panels and not brick.
- There has been noise and mess for around one year during the construction of a loft conversion at the application site.

It should be noted that the third set of amended details was not subject to additional publicity as there were no physical changes to the proposed development and because the proposed storage use for the garage would have less impact on the surrounding occupiers than the proposed granny annex use.

Officer's Analysis

A number of the comments from local residents relate to issues regarding accessing and understanding the plans/nature of the proposed development. However it is noted that the amended plans and clarification emails from the agent have addressed the majority of these concerns.

Design, Character and Appearance

The proposed external facing materials would match with those existing and the general design of the development would not be out of character with the existing building or the surroundings.

The proposed rear extension would add 1.3 metres depth to an existing rear projection, making a total depth of 4.7 metres across the full width of the building (measurements scaled from submitted drawings). Although it is noted that the annotation on drawing no. PE1417 refers to the proposed depth as 4.8 metres. In addition, the existing flat roof would be replaced with a pitched roof. Whilst the proposal would result in a substantial extension (if either depth is constructed), the structure would not be widely visible in the surrounding area and taking into account the fact that a 6 metre deep by 4 metres tall extension could be built using permitted development rights, then it is considered that the proposed rear extension would be of appropriate design.

The proposed porch would be 3.8 metres wide and have a depth of between 1.5 and 1.8 metres and would extend beyond the main side elevation of the dwelling. Whilst this design approach is not common in the surrounding area, there is a much larger example (a two storey, front/side extension) at no. 33 Frobisher Way. In addition, there is an existing single storey side extension at the application site. In this context, it is considered that the proposed porch would be of appropriate design.

The proposed garage conversion would increase the height of the building but its overall appearance would remain similar to existing and as such, it would be appropriate in terms of design.

Overall the proposed development would be in keeping with the character of the existing building and its surroundings and would be appropriate in terms of materials and design. As such, the proposal would be in line with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014).

Amenity of Future Occupiers

The proposed development would result in a reduction in the size of the rear garden from 78 square metres (with a depth of 11.3 metres) to 74 square metres (with a depth of 10.2 metres). The application property was originally a three bedroom dwelling, which according to the Borough Council's adopted Residential Layout Guidelines (RLG) should have a minimum garden area of 60 square metres with 10 metres depth. Following the erection of a rear dormer (under permitted development) the property now has four bedrooms, which according to the RLG should have a minimum garden area of 100 square metres with 10 metres depth. However as the additional bedroom did not require planning permission and because the rear garden is still larger than the minimum area/depth for a three bedroom dwelling, it is considered that sufficient amenity space would be available.

Overall, the proposed development would not be detrimental to the residential amenity of future occupiers and would be in line with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014).

Neighbouring Amenity

The closest neighbouring residential properties to the application site are nos. 20 and 24 Frobisher Way (adjoining to the north and south respectively) and no. 12 Torrens Walk (located to the west). Nos. 27, 29 and 31 Frobisher Way are located across the roadway to the east.

It is noted that local residents have raised concerns regarding adverse overlooking and overshadowing impacts and the loss of sunlight caused by the proposed development. These have been taken into account in the following discussion.

The increased height of the garage roof and the enlarged porch would have no adverse overshadowing or overbearing impacts to surrounding occupiers. The proposed extension would have a significant depth (some 4.8 metres) with a pitched roof and the proximity of the existing conservatory at no. 20 Frobisher Way is noted. The proposal would increase the height of the roof of the existing rear projection by some 300mm (at its highest point) and its depth by 1.3 metres. Therefore whilst some adverse overshadowing and loss of light impacts to the occupiers of no. 20 would occur, these would not be so significant as to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

In terms of overlooking, the rear windows in the proposed extension would have a 20 metre privacy distance to the side elevation of no. 12 Torrens Walk (where a first floor window overlooks the rear of the application site). Although this privacy distance is less than the 26 metres minimum set out in the RLG, it is considered that, as there is existing overlooking and because the proposal would only add some 1.3 metres to an existing rear projection and a larger extension could be built using permitted development rights, then a refusal of planning permission on overlooking grounds would not be justified.

The window in the front elevation of the proposed porch would face nos. 27 to 31 Frobisher Way and have a privacy distance of over 21 metres and would not result in any adverse overlooking impacts.

The proposed windows in the side elevation of the converted garage would face no. 20 Frobisher Way and as the boundary treatment between the application site and this property is between 1.2 and 1.8 metres in height some adverse overlooking impacts would occur. Whilst it is noted that there are windows in similar locations in the existing garage, these are at a higher level and would not afford as much overlooking. Therefore in order to prevent a loss of privacy, any planning permission granted should be conditioned to require the garage windows to be obscure glazed.

The proposed window in the front elevation of the converted garage would face the rear elevation of no. 24 Frobisher Way, with a privacy distance of only 12 metres. Whilst some screening would be provided by the existing boundary treatment, due to the proximity of the buildings, some adverse overlooking impacts to the bedroom window at no. 24 would occur. Therefore in order to prevent a loss of privacy, any planning permission granted should be conditioned to require the garage window to be obscure glazed.

In order to ensure that there is no future adverse overlooking impact to any of the adjacent occupiers, any planning permission granted should include a condition to preclude the insertion of additional windows in any of the side elevations of the proposed development.

Overall the proposed development would not be detrimental to the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers and would be in line with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014).

Parking and Highways Impacts

The proposed development would result in the loss of an existing garage but the proposed parking plan illustrates the provision of three parking spaces on the site frontage. It should be noted that one of the proposed parking spaces would encroach over a shared driveway (shared with no. 24 Frobisher Way) and an existing frontage parking area already accommodates two vehicles.

The GBC Highways Officer highlights the encroachment issue but does not raise an objection to the proposal (as two non-encroaching parking spaces would be provided) and suggests that a dedicated crossover should be constructed for the existing frontage parking area and that the applicant should consider the installation of the cables to support a future electric vehicle charging point. These issues can be covered by a planning condition (crossover) and an informative (cables) on any planning permission granted. Furthermore the permanent retention of the existing frontage car parking area can be subject to a planning condition.

Overall, the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety and would be in line with Policy CS11 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014) and Saved Policies T1 and P5 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

The application site is located in an area of multi-period archaeological potential. However KCC Heritage raise no objection to the proposed development. As such, the proposal would have no adverse impacts archaeology and would be in line with Policy CS20 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014) and Saved Policy TC7 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review 1994.

The application site is located close to gas pipelines (at the front and rear of the site). However, as the

proposed development is within the confines of an existing residential garden, then it is considered that there would be no adverse impacts to the gas infrastructure.

The application site is located within a smoke control area and advice regarding smokeless fuels/appliances can be given to the applicant in an informative attached to any planning permission granted.

Local residents have raised a number of concerns regarding the proposed development, the majority of which have either been addressed in the above discussion or are no longer relevant as the proposed garage would not be used for habitable accommodation. The outstanding issues are set out and commented upon as follows;

- Concerns regarding surface water drainage – this matter would be covered by Building Regulations.
- The proposed extension would go beyond the permitted building line – ‘permitted building line’ is not a common planning term and as such, it is unclear exactly what is being referred to. Notwithstanding this, the depth of the proposed extension has been considered in both design and amenity impact terms above and is considered acceptable.
- There has been noise and mess for around one year during the construction of a loft conversion at the application site – this is unfortunate but not relevant to the determination of this application. However any planning permission granted for the current proposal would include an informative relating to good practice during construction work.

Suggested conditions

Standard time limit

Development in accordance with the approved plans

Materials to match existing

Provision of crossover prior to first occupation

No further windows

Permanent retention of existing frontage parking area

Use of outbuilding for incidental purposes only

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposed development complies with local and national planning policies and subject to the conditions set out above, planning permission can be granted.

(For detailed conditions and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Mrs Kelly Joyce	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:	<i>K Joyce</i>	Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	18th January 2022	Dated:	18 th January 2022