



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20230771

Location: 55 Haynes Road Northfleet Gravesend Kent

Description: Erection of rear double garage.

Applicant: Mr Hamza Metalia

Site Visit Date: 4th October 2023

Submitted Documents/Plans

Householder Application for Planning Permission form;
Red line site boundary plan; and
Drawing no. FA-001-501 Rev. E Proposed layout, elevations and block plan.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20221163	Erection of a double garage at the rear of the property.	Refused	21.12.2022
20190789	Erection of a rear double garage.	Permitted	08.11.2019
20180573	Erection of a rear garage.	Refused	02.01.2019
	Appeal ref. AP2019/00012/REF	Dismissed	02.07.2019

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;
- SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006);
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021); and

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

GBC Highways Officer

I have no highway objections, but please note the building is large for a double garage. I measure the internal width at some 6.4 metres and a depth of 7.4 metres, this compares with the Kent County Council preferred size of 6 metres wide by 5.5 metres long.

Taking these factors into account the preferred internal dimensions of a garage that should be considered for residential developments in Kent are:

Preferred Garage Size for Single Car	5.5m (length) x 3.6m (width)
Preferred Garage Size for Two Cars	5.5m (length) x 6.0m (width)

Extract from the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006 Mapping out the future Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG 4 Kent Vehicle Parking Standards July 2006.

I note the width of the door at 3 metres which is wide for a single garage, whilst narrow for a double garage. There is the possibility that at some stage this garage may be considered as suitable for a commercial use or conversion. Any change of use should be considered by the planning authority to ensure there will be no adverse impact created by the change or conversion, so would suggest that suitable conditions are imposed to ensure the building can only be used for the domestic parking of vehicles ancillary to the occupation of the main dwelling.

GBC - Housing Manager (Housing Landlord Services)

No response received.

Neighbouring properties

The application was publicised to ten neighbouring properties by letter. No representations have been received.

Officer's Analysis

Background

Planning permission was refused in January 2019 for a detached double garage with a curved aluminium roof design at the application site (reference 2018573). That garage had dimensions of 8 metres (width) by 7 metres (depth) by 4 metres (maximum height). In dismissing an appeal against the refusal, the Inspector stated that;

'Given the overall size, scale and bulk of the garage, it would dominate the garden of the host property, 55 Haynes Road. Due to its size and scale and materials, particularly the curved aluminium roof, it would appear rather industrial in appearance, out of keeping with the domestic appearance of the residential garden of 55 Haynes Road. It would also be prominent when viewed from neighbouring gardens, particularly from 53 Haynes Road, given that it would extend close to the side boundary with that property.

The proposed garage would also be highly prominent when viewed from the access road to the rear. A number of surrounding properties particularly in Packham Road have outbuildings to the rear, served by the same rear access. Several of these buildings are of poor quality construction and appearance although most are of a more domestic scale than the appeal proposal. Overall, the proposed garage, due to its overall design, size, scale, bulk and materials, would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the surrounding area.'

Planning permission was granted in November 2019 for a detached double garage with a low pitched, gable ended roof design at the application site (reference 20190789). That garage had a dimensions of 7.1 metres (width) by 7 metres (depth) by 3 metres (maximum height).

Planning permission was refused in December 2022 for a detached double garage with a crown roof design (reference 20221163). That garage had dimensions of 8.2 metres (width) by 8.5 (depth) by 4 metres (maximum height). The ground of refusal was;

The proposed development, by reason of its design, size, scale and bulk, would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the application site and the surrounding area and contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014, to the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) and to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

The current proposal has dimensions of 7 metres (width) by 8 metres (depth) by 4 metres (maximum height) with a low pitched, gable ended roof design.

Principle of Development

The application site is located in an urban area, where domestic outbuildings are commonplace. Therefore it is considered that the principle of providing an outbuilding is not objectionable in planning policy terms. However, in order to determine whether the detail of the development is satisfactory, it is necessary to examine the potential for amenity impacts and any design and other issues.

Design, Character and Appearance

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 outbuildings, the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) sets out that proposals;

- Should only be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the house;
- Should not deprive the existing property of adequate private garden space and should be subordinate to the existing dwelling and plot;
- The Council will consider factors such as the scale, height, proximity to boundaries, roof design, finishing materials and prominence in the street scene or rear garden environment;

- Should not detract from the character of the area; and
- Should not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding properties in terms of noise and disturbance created through access or overlooking/overshadowing of existing properties.

The proposed external facing materials and roof design would match with the existing dwelling at the application site. The proposed garage would have a large footprint and height and would be widely visible in the surrounding area by virtue of its proximity to a private access used by the occupiers of dwellings in Haynes Road, Packham Road and Alders Court. However, as the proposed design would be in keeping with the surroundings and because the outbuilding is located in a large garden, sufficiently distanced from neighbouring buildings, then there would be no significant adverse impacts to visual amenity.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

The proposed development would result in a reduction in the size of the rear garden at the application site but sufficient rear garden area (111 square metres) and depth (15 metres) would be retained. As such, the proposal would not be detrimental to the amenity of future occupiers and would be in line with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014) and the Residential Layout Guidelines (June 2020).

Neighbouring Amenity

The closest residential properties to the application site are nos. 53 and 57 Haynes Road (located to the north east and south west respectively). No. 10 Alders Court is located to the south east across a private roadway and no. 1 Packham Road is located to the west.

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

In order to prevent any future loss of privacy to neighbours, any planning permission granted should be conditioned to preclude the insertion of any windows or openings in the side elevations of the proposed development.

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

The application property has no off-street parking provision at present and as a result of the proposed development, two vehicles could be accommodated on site (albeit with a constrained garage door arrangement). No objection has been raised by the GBC Highways Officer but he raises concerns regarding the potential for future conversion or commercial use.

In order to ensure that the use of the outbuilding remains as a garage, a condition should be attached to any planning permission granted to preclude any other uses.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would make sufficient provision for the parking of cars within the site in accordance with the Borough Council's adopted Vehicle Parking Standards and would be in line with 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.

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

The application site is located within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 2, an area of multi-period archaeological potential and is in close proximity to a gas pipeline (along the site frontage). However, as the proposed development would be within the confines of an existing residential rear garden and only a relatively small amount of groundworks would occur, then it is considered that there would be no adverse impacts to groundwater, archaeology or gas infrastructure. As such, the proposal would be in line with Policy CS20 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014) and Saved Policy TC7 of the

Gravesham Local Plan First Review November 1994.

Suggested Conditions

Time Limit

Development in accordance with the approved plans

Use as a garage only

Materials to match existing

No openings in the flank elevations

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposal would comply with local and national planning policies and subject to the conditions set out above, the proposal would be acceptable.

Planning permission subject to conditions is recommended.

(For detailed conditions and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Mrs Kelly Joyce	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:	<i>K Joyce</i>	Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	5th October 2023	Dated:	10th November 2023