



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20220581

Location: 71 St Dunstan's Drive Gravesend Kent DA12 4BH

Description: Erection of a two-storey side extension.

Applicant: Ms Ayobanji Owomoyela

Site Visit Date: Desktop Assessment

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application Form Dated 27 May 2022;
Site Location Plan Scale 1:1250;
Drawing no. 101 (Existing Floorplans)
Drawing no. 102 (Proposed Floorplans)
Drawing no. 103 (Existing Elevations);
Drawing no. 104 (Proposed Elevations);
Drawing no. 105 (Existing Site Plan); and
Drawing no.106 (Proposed Site Plan).

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20200171	Erection of a single storey rear extension and porch extension and front garden hardstanding.	Permitted	21 May 2020

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

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

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards

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;
- Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard (2015);
- SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006);
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021); and

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

GBC Highways Officer

This proposal changes a three-bedroom property into a four and potentially five-bedroom dwelling, as the new room downstairs with its bathroom could easily be used as a bedroom and would be particularly attractive for someone with a mobility issue.

Kent County Council vehicle parking standards for a four or more bedroom property in a suburban area, suggests that two car parking spaces should be provided, whilst for a three bedroom it would be an average of one and a half. I would recommend given the potential five bedrooms, two parking spaces should be provided and in addition secure parking should also be provided for two cycles to comply with SPG4 of one cycle space per bedroom

GBC Environmental Protection

Attached the watching brief condition, code of construction and smoke control informative.

Southern Gas Networks

No comment received.

Neighbouring properties

Eight surrounding properties were consulted and a site notice was also displayed. The overall consultation period expired on 19 July 2022 and on representation has been received. The comments are summarised below;

- Concerned about the large size of the extension; and
- Concerned about the change of outlook.

Officer's Analysis

Site Description

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached, 3 no. bed dwelling located within the urban area of Gravesend. The property does not appear to have any off-street parking provision with the exception of a garage to the rear.

The surrounding area is residential in character, with properties being similar in architectural design. The crescent to which the application property sits are all matching in design with none of the properties being extended to the side at two storey. The application property itself is located on a prominent corner plot where the prevailing character is open with a clear building line within the surrounding street scene;



Planning permission was recently refused at no. 91 St Dunstan's Drive on 27 May 2022 under reference 20220018 for a two-storey side extension in a similar situation.

Proposal

The proposal seeks permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension. The ground floor element of the extension is 4 metres wide and 7.4 metres deep. It is flush with the front elevation of the existing dwelling. The first-floor element is the same width as the ground floor but set back from the front elevation by 1m. The two-storey side extension is designed to be subservient to the main dwelling with a lower ridge line and generous set back. The extension varies between being 2.1m and 2.6 metres from the boundary of the property. The proposal will create a new entrance hallway, downstairs room (not specified) and bathroom, with an additional bedroom with ensuite at first floor level.

Design, Character and Appearance

The design of the proposed two storey side extension is considered to be broadly acceptable. From the front it is subservient in design and also respects the character of the original property by including design features such as the dormers in the roof creating by the low eaves. The width of the extension is not considered excessive. The extension is quite bulky to the rear which is often acceptable, but given the prominent corner location of the property, this would need to be addressed.

However, despite the positive design of the extension there is a fundamental issue with the construction of a two-storey side extension in this location. There is an established building line with the corner properties being set in from side boundaries by a minimum of 6 metres;



The proposed two storey side extension would be set closer to the boundary and would result in the erosion of the clearly established and maintained building line. No other development has interrupted this pre-planned set-back which creates an important sense of openness in the urban area. The loss of this open character will result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area and as such there is a fundamental objection to the proposal.

This approach is consistent with a similar application refused at no. 91 St Dunstan's Drive on 27 May 2022 under reference 20220018.

The development is considered to be an inappropriate addition to the property which is harmful to the character of the wider area though the disruption of the established building line within the street scene. On this basis, the proposal fails to accord with the requirements of Policy CS19 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021).

Amenity of Future Occupiers

The Residential Layout Guidelines SPD2 (June 2020) maintains that a dwelling of 4 bedrooms or more should have a minimum private amenity space of 100sq.m and a minimum of 10m garden depth. The retained garden area would measure 169sq.m with a minimum distance of 10m. Therefore the private amenity space retained at the site would exceed the minimum standard and there is no objection in this regard.

The proposed rooms are appropriately sized and serve by adequate natural light, and future occupants would not suffer from any loss of privacy. Any bathroom windows would be conditioned to be obscure glazed.

Therefore the proposal would accord with the Policy CS19 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF (2021).

Neighbouring Amenity

The proposed two storey side extension would be located to the side and would be set over 20m away from the properties on the opposite side of St Dunstan's Drive. Therefore due to the distance to the nearest property and the path of the sun, the proposal would not result in a loss of outlook, overshadowing, loss of light or privacy.

There would be no habitable room windows located on the proposed flank elevation wall. The window proposed serves a bathroom and so would be obscure glazed.

One representation has been received in relation to the proposal concerning the large size of the extension and loss of outlook. These issues have been addressed throughout the report.

As such neighbour amenity has been safeguarded in accordance with Policy CS19 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF 2021.

Highways and Parking

The proposal would result in one additional bedroom, altering the property to a 4-bed dwelling. It is unclear what the ground floor room is to be used for, but as it is not specified as a bedroom, it needs to be taken at face value. The KCC Parking Standards (2006) states that a 4-bed dwelling should have 3 spaces. No details have been provided in relation to the parking provision at the property, either currently or proposed. As mentioned previously, there is a garage to the rear which is reached via an access road which suggests there is some parking provision.

Where the application to be looked upon favourably without a fundamental objection, further clarification would have been sought regarding the parking provision.

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

Environmental Protection – were the application to be approved, a condition regarding a watching brief for contamination would be required, along with the works of construction information and the smoke control informative.

Conclusion

The application has been fully considered and it is recommended that planning permission be refused for the following reason;

By virtue of the location, prominence and proximity to the highway, the proposed two storey side extension is considered to be an unacceptable form of development as it results in the erosion of the established building line and disruption of the open character of the corner plot, which is detrimental to the character and appearance of the property itself and of the wider area. As such, the proposal would fail to comply with the requirements of Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Recommendation

Refusal

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

Case Officer:	Miss Faye Hobbs	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:		Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	21st July 2022	Dated:	21 July 2022