
From: Peter Price
Sent: 13 December 2022 11:44
To: Peter Price
Subject: FW: Planning Application 20220896 - Crabbles Cottage Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JS

From: Alistair Scott <ajscott54@outlook.com>
Sent: 05 December 2022 09:34
To: Peter Price <peter.price@gravesham.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Planning Application 20220896 - Crabbles Cottage Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JS

Peter Hi!

Further to my email of the 20th October requesting that you place the application on temporary hold, we have at last produced revised information that will hopefully allow you to progress the application to determination. Please accept the attached revised documentation into the application as supplementary/revised to the documents already submitted. Please lift the temporary hold and allow the application to re-start.

We have revised the design and have reduced the size and the impact on the original portion of the dwelling. As can be seen from the area calculations the footprint of the development is only a 7.9% increase.

I have produced revised area calculations, which are overall external areas, and have, for clarification, produced area block plans showing the expansion of the property over the years. In 2020 the original conservatory and sunlounge single storey extensions were replaced along with the original single garage. At this stage my client approached your department and it was confirmed that whilst in the Green Belt the proposed works could proceed as permitted development.

We are now proposing the add extensions works, especially to the first floor, which is current severely limited in available accommodation. The applicants' family are growing and the bedroom accommodation needs rationalising and enlarging. We proposed extending above the existing flat roof ground floor and demolishing the existing detached garage, linking a new double garage and extending above..

The upper floor extension is designed to compliment the original and is designed to compliment and balance the resultant construction. The Garage and accommodation over is fully set back so as to fully reduce the impact. I have produced Isometric projections. existing and proposed along with a marked up copy of the proposed showing the location of the existing detached garage that is being demolished. It is clear from the drawings that the revised design greatly reduces the development impact on the overall site, thus meeting some of your concerns.

We are indeed proposing development to a property located in the green belt and as such is contrary to the local plan provisions. However the overall development impact is, as indicated above, only 7.9% increase in terms of footprint and is reduced in expanse of impact on the green belt and the locality. The upper extension whilst more substantial are designed to enhance the overall dwelling and the side extension is set back making it totally subservient to the main. All in all the overall increase of 38% ought to be considered acceptable for the above reasons.

You indicate that the proposals are unacceptable and contrary to the provisions as development in the green belt. Whilst in principle this may be basically correct it should however be taken in relationship with the major amount of development that has been permitted in the immediate locality. As a guide I have produce the attached appraisal of the immediate neighbouring properties 85% of which have been subject to, in many case major development. I refer particularly to the following properties.

The immediate neighbours Springhill and Deglan have been subjected to extensive extensions and expansion over the original dwellings, basically what we are proposing. Springhill a two storey dwelling immediately opposite the application site has extended to the side of the original dwelling and added extensions to the rear. The impact is effectively the same as we are proposing but much more bulky. They have since their approved extension in 2008, built a further side extension a further 30% footprint increase. They have additionally built a substantial rear outbuilding and more importantly a double garage to the front of their property. All in all you have allowed extensive development to this one dwelling in the green belt. Deglan similarly has expended over the years with extensive side extensions which have then been extended over, all in a similar fashion to what is proposed on our application. Yet again development in the green belt

Long Reach, a dwelling on the north side of Pear Tree Lane to the west of the application site is a refurbished detached dwelling which has been extended by the addition of a third storey, once again development in the green belt. Crow's-nest further down Pear Tree Lane to the west has been subject to massive redevelopment and additional works over the original dwelling. Indeed a building, larger than the dwelling has been built in the rear, along with extensive outbuildings, once again permitted in the green belt. Shorne Mead has similarly extended, built numerous outbuildings and more importantly form a large pond/small lake all of which is development requiring your approval.

The attached appraisal is only a very simple straw pole of the immediate local properties, which I am sure you are no doubt fully aware of. Our application is potentially in contravention with the basic premise of development in the green belt but the principle has been fully granted by your department given that most if not all of the local properties have had developments fully permitted by you thus establishing the principle.

So if the principle of development having been accepted by you on neighbouring dwellings it falls to the actual design and impact, We maintain that the reduced revised proposals result in a sympathetic integrated expansion of the property to the enhancement of the dwelling and the local area. Immediately opposite a much less subtle development has been approved and the development majorly expanded being far more intrusive in design and bulk. Whilst the application site is located with the dwelling much closer to the highway, the retention of the existing mature trees and hedges will maintain the streetscape and the area with little or no impact.

This site merits a reasonable dwelling, all in the same fashion as most site in the area, and the design allows for the consolidation of the development with a more sympathetic, rationalised overall end result.

I trust that this submission will now meet with your approval. I intend sending separate emails with photographs of Springhill and Deglan for your assistance/information.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need any clarification. All documents are either A4 or A3

Yours Alistair