

Penfold Project Services

“EPMARKET”, WROTHAM ROAD, MEOPHAM, KENT, DA13 0JH
Telephone: 01474 816690
e-mail: apenfold448@btinternet.com

**LEYWOOD FARM, LEYWOOD ROAD,
MEOPHAM, KENT, DA13 0UD**

HERITAGE/DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

APRIL 2024

Introduction

This application is submitted for the erection of a single storey side infill extension to the southern corner of the bungalow.

The extension will provide a modest enlargement of the existing Lounge.



Existing Property

Leywood Farm is situated within the Harvel area of the parish of Meopham and is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

The property comprises of a bungalow with domestic garden areas, two barns and stables.

The current configuration of the bungalow is that as granted of planning consent (reference 19930736) on 02 March 1994

The applicant also owns land to the north in which is located a riding sand school.

Submitted Documents/Plans

The application comprises the following documents and plans:

Application form;

Drawing No.01 – Plans & Elevations As Existing – A1

Drawing No.02A – Plans & Elevations As Proposed – A1

Drawing No.03A – Site Location Plan – A2

Drawing No.04A – Block Plan as Existing – A2

Drawing No.05C – Block Plan as Proposed – A2

Relevant Planning History

19840125 - Erection of single storey front and side extension to form hall kitchen diner lobby utility room and double garage - Permitted

19930501 - Occupation of a farm worker's bungalow without complying with the agricultural occupancy condition attached to planning permission – Certificate Granted

19930736 - Erection of two single storey extensions to form bedroom and bathroom at the front and utility room at the side. Continued use of former agricultural land for grazing of horses, retention of converted cowsheds as stables and recreational use of remaining farm yard – Permitted

20040031 - Erection of two replacement storage sheds – Permitted

20240042 - Application for a Proposed Lawful Development Certificate in respect of two single storey side extensions – Certificate Refused

20240213 - Installation of solar panels on barn roof – Pending Consideration

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

Saved Policies in the Gravesham Local Plan First Review (November 1994):

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards
- C13 – Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside

Other material considerations

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)

- Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
- Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
- Section 13 - Protecting Green Belt Land
- Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- SPG2 - Residential Layout Guidelines including Housing Standards Policy Statement October 2015 Adopted 1996 - amended June 2020
- SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006)
- Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment (2009)

Analysis

In light of this the application site is deemed to fall within the Green Belt and the proposals are therefore subject to Paragraph 145 of the NPPF which requires extensions or alterations to not be disproportionate to the original building and saved policy C13 (GLPFR) which restricts extensions to dwellings situated in the countryside to (C13.ii) “one third of the gross floor area of the original dwelling”, prior to any later extension or alteration, unless the increased floorspace has no overall effect on the existing bulk and appearance of the dwelling.

Character and Appearance

Leywood Farm is a detached bungalow in use as a single-family dwelling.

The property is located to the east of Leywood Road and behind Boughurst Farm

It is characterised by a low dual pitched roof with gable ends.

This application proposes the erection of a small infill extension to form an enlarged Lounge to the south behind the existing extension erected in 1994 and forming a Utility Room

The extension provides a balance to a symmetrical to the building forming the completion of the gable end wall to the South Elevation

All materials will match the existing bungalow

Extension to Dwelling

The application site is located in the Green Belt and as such Policy CS02 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (LPCS) (2014) is relevant. Development in the urban area is prioritised as the sustainable location for development. In the rural area, Policy CS02 (LPCS) states that development will be supported within rural settlements that are inset from the Green Belt and defined on the policies map.

Development outside those settlements, i.e. in the Green Belt, will only be supported where it is compatible with national policies for protecting the Green Belt and policies in the LPCS

There are five principle issues in determining this application;

1. Is the proposed development appropriate in the Green Belt?
2. The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt;
3. The effect on the character and appearance of the area;
4. Other matters;
5. Any very special circumstances; and
6. Impact on the Landscape.

1. Is the proposed development appropriate in the Green Belt?

There are strict policy considerations within the Green Belt whereby paragraph 147 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 goes on to say that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it falls within the specified exceptions. The relevant exception to consider for this application is part c of paragraph 149 of the NPPF, which states that it may be acceptable to extend or alter a building provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

In determining this proposal account will be taken of Saved Policy C13 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review (LPFR) (November 1994) which relates to extensions to dwellings in the countryside. It sets out a number of criteria

that should be met when considering proposals for domestic extensions. As the policy pre-dates the NPPF, the weight attached to the policy must be considered carefully, with greater weight being given where the approach is consistent with paragraph 149 of the NPPF.

In particular Policy C13 places an overall limit on extensions of one third of the gross floor area of the original dwelling unless the increased floor space has no overall effect on the existing bulk and appearance of the dwelling (criteria ii). It also requires the massing, scale and form of any extension to be appropriate to the existing dwelling and the Green Belt setting (criteria vi). It is considered that these factors are relevant in determining whether the size of an extension is proportionate and as such, these aspects of the policy are broadly in line with the NPPF and should be afforded due weight.

	Original Dwelling (m ²)	Extended Dwelling (m ²)	% Increase Above Original
Internal Floor Area Current	107.00	140.30	31.12%
Internal Floor Area Proposed	107.00	149.77	39.97%

The calculations demonstrate in regards to the one third limit of saved policy C13 that the extensions as carried out in 1994 were designed to be within the one third limit as allowed.

The additional extension as proposed would only marginally increase the internal floor area above the one third limit as allowed.

As demonstrated above, it is evident that the side extension forming the Utility Room was designed to a size to suit the residual area allowable in addition to the front extension.

The proposal introduces a modest infill extension in keeping with both the bungalow as originally erected and as extended in 1994. The floor area of the proposed extension is only 9.47m² (and additional 8.85% of the original floor area).

However, the numerical calculation forms only a part of the overall assessment. Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that it may be acceptable to extend or alter a building provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. It is does not provide a figure

The proposed extension will match the existing bungalow in all aspects: -

- The ridge height will match existing
- The eaves height will match existing
- All material including roof, walls, fascias, windows, etc

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not result in a disproportionate addition to the property and as such the proposal would not be inappropriate development which is by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. It is therefore in accordance to Policy CS02 (LPCS), Policy C13 (LPFR) and to paragraph 149 of the NPPF.

2. The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt

Paragraph 137 states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It also states that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence.

Any new built form of development is likely to impact on the openness of the Green Belt; however, it is important to establish the degree of harm. The development has been designed in order to reduce perceived bulk through subservience and a crack pitched roof form. Moreover, the retention of eaves at the same height maintains a balance appearance.

This proposal is therefore considered to maintain the openness of the Green Belt by virtue of its size and location in relation to the existing bungalow

Reference back to paragraphs 147 and 148 of the NPPF informs us that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances and that very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Whether the development causes any other harm and whether there are any other relevant considerations to balance the overall planning argument, should now be considered.

3. The effect on the character and appearance of the area

Policy CS19 (Development and Design Principles) (LPCS) states that new development will be visually attractive and locally distinctive. It should also conserve and enhance the character of the local built and natural environment and integrate well with the surrounding area.

This application comprises of the erection modest infill extension with all aspects of the design, ridge height, eaves height, etc all to match and align with the existing.

The rear and side walls of the extension do not project further than the rear wall of the original dwelling or the side wall of the existing extension. The proposed extension is therefore not visible from either the north or west elevation being concealed by the original dwelling nor for the south being concealed by the existing barn. The effect of the addition to the east elevation is therefore extremely minimal.



REAR OF BUNGALOW VIEWED FROM REAR GARDEN
LOOKING NORTH-WEST



REAR OF BUNGALOW VIEWED FROM REAR GARDEN
LOOKING WEST

The proposed development will have no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the property

To conclude, the extension to the property is well designed and proportionate to the scale of the host dwelling. As such the development hereby proposed should be considered to be good design in accordance with Policy CS19 (LPCS) and Section 12 of the NPPF.

4. Other matters

Amenity of Future Occupiers

The development will provide acceptable living conditions in accordance with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Neighbouring

There will be no impact on the amenity of adjoining properties in terms of loss of light, overlooking, sense of enclosure or loss of outlook. As such the proposal will safeguard the amenity of adjoining properties in accordance with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Parking and Highways

The proposed development will not impact on parking or highways.

5. Very special circumstances

No specific arguments are being submitted with this application in relation to the assessment of “very special circumstances”.

6. Impact on the Landscape

Policy CS12 (LPCS) seeks to protect the Green infrastructure within the Borough and states at 5.7.26 the overall landscape character and valued landscapes will be conserved, restored and enhanced.

The development does not impact due to it's secluded location. Therefore, the proposal accords with Policy CS12 (LPCS) and safeguards the quality of the Harvel Wooded Downs Landscape Character Area.

Conclusion

The proposed development is in keeping with the existing dwelling and should therefore be considered favourable and should be granted permission.