



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20230835

Location: 98B Wrotham Road Gravesend Kent DA11 0QH

Description: Erection of single storey rear/side extension and rear dormer with Juliet balcony and conversion of loft space into habitable accommodation.

Applicant: Mr And Mrs George And Hayley Whittaker

Site Visit Date: 28 September 2023

Submitted Documents/Plans

Householder Application for Planning Permission form;
Drawing no. P01 Rev. A Red line site boundary plan;
Drawing no. P02 Existing and proposed layouts, elevations and block plans; and
Drawing no. P03 Existing and proposed parking layout.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20000628	Alterations to increase the height of the roof on existing double garage at the rear with storage/games room in the roof space.	Withdrawn	21.11.2000
20000496	Alterations to increase height of roof by 1.5m on existing double garage at the rear with storage/games room in the roof space.	Refused	16.08.2000

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)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards
- T1 – Impact of Development on Highway Network
- TC7 – Other Archaeological Sites

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 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)
- Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3 Residential Parking (2008)
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

GBC Highways Officer

I have no highway objections there is enough car parking to comply with vehicle parking standards. However, given the extra bedroom there should be a secure cycle parking space provided, to comply with KCC SPG4.

GBC Environmental Protection Team (Regulatory Services)

Initial response:

No objection to this application. It is recommended that a condition requiring a Code of Practice on Construction is attached to any permission due to the proximity of other residential properties.

Second response:

I have this as being about 300m from the edge of the landfill site. As a precaution, we can include a watching brief condition as follows:

The applicant shall undertake a watching brief during construction in case any contamination issue is encountered. If during development any contamination is found, the local planning authority should be informed as soon as practical and the work shall not continue until written agreement is provided by the LPA as to the appropriate measures to be taken to resolve the matter and they are satisfied that those measures have been carried out.

Neighbouring properties

The application was publicised to 24 neighbouring properties by letter. No representations have been received. The overall consultation period expired on 07 September 2023.

Officer's Analysis

Design, Character and Appearance

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (NPPF) sets out various design requirements and includes the need for the development to add to the overall quality of an area; be visually attractive; and be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF 2023 states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 sets out that new development will be visually attractive, fit for purpose and locally distinctive. It should conserve and enhance the character of the built environment and take account of the scale, height, building lines and other architectural features of buildings. Account should also be taken of strategic views, site topography, the significance of heritage assets and features of townscape and landscape value which contribute to local character and sense of place.

In relation to rear roof extensions, the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) sets out that proposals should be set away from the gables, hips, eaves and ridge of a property; be lower than the existing ridge line and retain the original ridge line treatment; that dormers should not overwhelm the roof slope within which they are placed; and that windows should reflect the position, design and character of existing windows on the host building.

In relation to single storey rear extensions, the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) sets out that they should not dominate the original property (extensions to extensions will not generally be supported); they should not rise above the window cill level of any first floor windows; they should not be excessive in height, especially where they are greater than three metres in depth; or excessive in width (no greater than the original building). Flats roofs can be acceptable where they are not widely visible and pitched roof designs should reflect the main roof.

In relation to side extensions, the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) sets out that care is needed when considering the relationship between the proposal and the boundary with the neighbouring property, as the separation between properties can provide access routes to the rear of the property and in some locations be part of the character of the area. In addition, side extensions should appear subservient to the original building; be no greater than half the width of the original building; incorporate roof designs to reflect the main roof; and window designs and proportions to reflect those existing and local character.

The application property is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling with three bedrooms located in a residential area. The existing side elevation of the building is visible in the street scene, as the adjacent property is set back;



The proposed development comprises of the erection of single storey rear/side extension and a rear dormer with a Juliet balcony and the conversion of the loft space into a bedroom, walk-in-wardrobe, shower room and storage area.

The proposed rear/side extension would extend across the full width of the rear elevation and project outwards at the side of the building by 1.5 metres. However, the extension would not be over-dominate the host building and would be set away from the side boundary with no. 98A Wrotham Road by one metre,

retaining an external rear access. The proposed external facing and roof design materials would match with the existing building but the proposed fenestration would not. It is noted that a similar rear extension (but without the projection at the side of the building) has been erected at no. 98C Wrotham Road and that the proposed extension would not be widely visible in the surrounding area. In light of this and despite a number of departures from the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021), it is considered that the proposed rear/side extension would not be significantly out of character with the existing building.

The proposed dormer extension would extend across the full width of the rear roof slope and project beyond the side roof slope of the building, overwhelming the roof slope in which it would be placed. As such, it would not be subservient to the existing roof and would be highly visible in the surrounding area. The proposed Juliet balcony would introduce a window design that does not reflect the position, design or character of existing windows and so would look out of place on the host building.

Overall, it is considered that due to the excessive width and projection beyond the side roof slope of the rear dormer and the inclusion of inappropriate fenestration within the dormer, the proposed development would result in an incongruous and over-dominant addition, which would be poorly designed and out of character with the existing building. As such, the proposal would undermine the visual amenities of the host building and the surrounding area and would be inconsistent with the guidance set out in the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) and contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and paragraph 130 of the NPPF 2023.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 requires new development to be located, designed and constructed to safeguard the amenity, including privacy, daylight and sunlight, of its occupants. In this regard, the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) and the Borough Council's adopted Residential Layout Guidelines (RLG) are relevant.

The proposed bedroom in the roof space would exceed the minimum floor area requirements for a double bedroom in the Nationally Described Space Standard (2015) and the garden, following the proposed rear/side extension, would exceed the size and depth requirements for a dwelling with four or more bedrooms in the Residential Layout Guidelines (June 2020).

The proposed development would improve the living conditions for future occupiers and as such, the proposal would not be detrimental to residential amenity and would be in line with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014).

Neighbouring Amenity

Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 requires new development to be located, designed and constructed to safeguard the amenity, including privacy, daylight and sunlight, of neighbouring occupiers. In this regard, the Borough Council's adopted Residential Layout Guidelines (RLG) are relevant.

The closest residential properties to the application site are nos. 98A and 98C Wrotham Road (located to the north and south respectively). Nos. 6A, 6, 8 and 10 Portland Road are located to the north. No. 28 Elmfield Close is located to the east and nos. 147 to 151 Wrotham Road are located to the west, across the roadway.

Due to the design of the proposed development and to the layout and orientation of the surrounding properties, there would be no adverse overshadowing or overbearing impacts to the occupiers of the surrounding dwellings.

The proposed development would introduce a number of new windows to the application property. The RLG set out that privacy distances between facing windows should be met, in order to prevent overlooking. A privacy distance of 21 metres is required for facing windows where there is no private garden area in between and a privacy distance of 26 metres is required where a private garden is within the field of view.

The proposed rear dormer would have a Juliet balcony to a bedroom. The privacy distance for the Juliet balcony to no. 28 Elmfield Close (the closest neighbour at the rear) would be over 50 metres. Whilst the Juliet balcony would overlook the rear gardens of nos. 6A, 6 and 8 Portland Road, it is noted that the privacy distance would be in excess of 26 metres and the sight line would be oblique. As such, there would be no adverse overlooking impacts to the occupiers of these properties.

The Juliet balcony would also overlook the rear gardens of nos. 98A and 98C Wrotham Road. However, as existing rear windows have similar overlooking impacts, the occupiers of these properties cannot not have a realistic expectation of total privacy in their gardens. Dormer windows are a common feature in the residential environment and in many instances are development that does not require planning permission, therefore it is considered that there would be no significant adverse overlooking impacts from the Juliet balcony to the occupiers of nos. 98A and 98C Wrotham Road.

The proposed rear dormer would have a shower room window in the side elevation facing no. 98A Wrotham Road. In order to prevent overlooking to no. 98A Wrotham Road, the proposed shower room window should be conditioned to be permanently obscure glazed.

Due to the screening provided by boundary treatments and to the layout and orientation of the surrounding properties, there would be no adverse overlooking impacts from the proposed windows in the rear/side extension to the occupiers of the surrounding dwellings.

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

Policy CS11 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 and Saved Policies T1 and P3 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review November 1994 require new development to mitigate its impact on the highway and public transport networks and to provide sufficient parking in accordance with adopted parking standards.

The proposed development would result in the dwelling increasing from three bedrooms to four and there would be no alteration to the existing parking or access arrangements. The existing frontage parking area could accommodate two vehicles and the GBC Highways Officer has not raised an objection.

As a four or more bedroom property following the proposed development, the adopted Vehicle Parking Standards require a maximum provision of three parking spaces. However it is noted that the Highway Authority have more recent guidance that requires a minimum of two spaces to be provided for a four bedroom property in a suburban area.

The GBC Highways Officer seeks the provision of a cycle parking space to comply with the KCC Parking Standards (2006). However, as sufficient space would be available at the application site to provide cycle parking, should the applicant wish to provide it, then there would be no need to condition cycle parking provision in any planning permission granted.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would make sufficient provision for the parking of cars within the application site and would have no adverse impacts to highway safety. Therefore, the proposal would be in line with Policy CS11 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 and Policy P3 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review November 1994.

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

The application site is located within the buffer zone for the Woodfield Avenue historic landfill site and the GBC Environmental Protection Team have set out the wording for a watching brief condition. Therefore, provided that this condition is attached to any planning permission granted, then there would be no adverse ground contamination impacts.

The application site is located within an area of multi-period archaeological potential, Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone and a smoke control area. However, as the proposed development would be within the confines of an existing residential garden and only a relatively small amount of groundworks would occur, then it is considered that there would be no adverse impacts to any sensitive habitats, archaeological interests or groundwater. With regard to the smoke control area, advice regarding smokeless fuels/appliances can be given to the applicant in an informative attached to any planning permission granted.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposed rear dormer would be inappropriate in design, out of character with the existing building and detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene. The positive features of the proposed development (that it would improve the living conditions for future occupiers, it would not be detrimental to residential amenity, highway safety, sensitive habitats, archaeological interests or groundwater) would not overcome the negative impacts and as such, planning permission should be refused.

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

Case Officer:	Mrs Kelly Joyce	Team Leader:	Miss Faye Hobbs
Signed:		Signed:	
Dated:	10th October 2023	Dated:	10 October 2023