



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20240356

Location: 33 Hever Court Road Gravesend Kent DA12 5EG

Description: Erection of a first floor extension over existing porch.

Applicant: Mr Mihad Uddin

Site Visit Date: Desktop Assessment

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application Form
2024/07/01 – Block Plan
2024/07/02 – Existing Floor Plans
2024/07/03 – Existing Elevations
2024/07/04 – Proposed Floor Plans
2024/07/05 – Proposed Elevations
Email received 03.06.24 – Materials

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20061087 APP/K2230/A /08/2080477	Erection of 16 two storey semi-detached affordable dwellings comprising 2 two bedroom, 8 three bedroom and 6 four bedroom dwellings and laying out of associated parking spaces, widening of vehicular access onto Hever Court Road and formation of an associated access road.	Allowed at appeal	01.07.2008

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 (2023) 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 (2023), the Council will also seek to replace these.

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

- Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- Section 12 – Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

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);
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

Ward Councillors:

No comments received.

Neighbouring properties

3no. surrounding properties were consulted, and 0 comments were received from members of the public. The final date to submit comments ended on 28th June 2024.

Officer's Analysis

Principle of Development

This application is located inside the Urban Boundary, where alterations and extensions to residential buildings are generally acceptable in principle as per Policy CS02: Scale and Distribution of Development.

On front extensions the

However, all other relevant matters should be considered. In this instance, the main points to consider would be the potential impact on; Visual Amenity (Design, Character and Appearance), Amenity of Future Occupiers and Residential Amenity of neighbours.

Design, Character and Appearance

The proposed extension is located on the front elevation, which would be visible to the public. It would therefore have a greater impact on the streetscene. On front extensions, the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021), states:

10.7 Front extensions can change the character of the original building and where poorly designed have a negative impact on the appearance of the street; due to their visibility these kind of extensions are most likely to have an impact on the wider street scene and are generally discouraged. It is therefore important to invest a high level of design quality in such proposals following the guidance below:

- **Design:** Front extensions must be designed to respond to and enhance the character of the existing dwelling and street.
- **Scale:** The scale and design of new porches should respond to the existing dwelling.
- **Existing Features:** Care should be taken to preserve the appearance of existing features, such as bay windows, and avoid porches that would impact these by subsuming their form or erasing their prominence. Existing porches that are open to the street, and are an original feature that form part of a local pattern of development, should generally not be enclosed.
- **Car Parking:** Extensions or porches should not result in the retention of front parking spaces of inadequate depth.

Looking at the streetscene, it can be seen that there are a variety of designs and layouts. 31, 33 and 35 Hever Court Road are viewed together as they are set back from the streetscene with a similar build line, whilst 41 and 43 Hever Court Road and 1 Westfield Close are positioned closer to Hever Court Road.

The proposed addition would not extend the footprint of the building and the existing build line would be retained. It would also retain the existing eave height with the ridge of the proposed roof set below the main roof. However, from the side and front elevation it can be seen that the roof would, whilst attempting to use a similar style of roof pitch, would result in a cluttered and incongruent appearance, which would not assimilate well with the existing roof form. This would be due to its much lower ridge height than the main dwellinghouse and the resultant appearance of multiple gable ends to the side elevation.

Porches are designed to be a single storey, subservient feature of dwellinghouses. They are often only appropriate forward of the main dwellinghouse, as they are generally small in footprint and single storey. To alter this to a two-storey extension, would also result in an overwhelming front projection in a highly visible and prominent area forming part of the streetscene. The application form and emails from the planning agent details that the addition would use clay, wall hung tiles to the exterior walls, concrete roof tiles and upvc window frames.

On balance, the proposed development would **NOT** comply with the requirements of Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2023) in terms of design, character and appearance.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

The NPPF (2023) states that planning decisions should aim to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users. The impact on amenity is also considered with regard to the criteria with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy, which states that new development should be located, designed and constructed to safeguard the amenity, including privacy, daylight and sunlight, of its occupants, and those of neighbouring properties and land. The impact on neighbours will be assessed in the next section of the report.

The proposed extension would create a shower room, with a WC. It would have an area of 5m². The minimum space requirements for such a room would be 3.6m² as per the Residential Layout Guidance (2020). There would be no change to garden amenity space.

Neighbouring Amenity

As outlined above, it is important that any development safeguards the amenity of neighbouring properties and land. Following a period of consultation with neighbouring properties, no objection to the proposal was received.

31 Hever Court Road

This neighbour is located to the west. There is an existing distance of 1.7m between the dwellings. This would be unchanged as a result of the scheme. The proposed extension would increase the height of this section of the building and so potential overshadowing should be considered. As the below image shows, there are 2no. side facing windows and 2no. rear facing windows closest to the boundary, which could potentially be overshadowed by the development.



Google image dated November 2022



45 Degree test

As the above image shows, the 45 degree test from the edge of the proposed extension (yellow line) would not intercept the 45 degree test from the approximate position of this neighbours windows (indicated in yellow, blue and green).

The proposed extension would not result in any first floor side openings and so there would be no likely overlooking resulting from the proposed extension.

35 Hever Court Road

This neighbour is located to the east. There is an existing distance of 2.3m between the dwellings. This would be unchanged as a result of the scheme. The proposed extension would not directly affect this neighbour as it would be located to the west side of the dwellinghouse and would not project further to the front. The height of the proposed extension would be below the height of the main ridge of the roof. Given these factors, the extension would have limited impact on this neighbours and would not result in any increased overshadowing, or overlooking to this neighbours property.

The proposal is therefore considered to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring properties in compliance with policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposed development by virtue of its scale, bulk, massing and design would be an overly dominant and incongruous form of development which would not be sympathetic to or in keeping with the immediate streetscene it is situated in. The positive contribution that the existing dwelling makes to the streetscene would be replaced with a development that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the

streetscene. In this respect the proposal is contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

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

Case Officer:	Mrs Lisa Fisher	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:		Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	1 st July 2024	Dated:	1st July 2024