



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20220805

Location: 47 Truro Road Gravesend Kent DA12 5RQ

Description: Erection of a side extension to provide a self-contained facility and single storey rear extension.

Applicant: Mrs Shelley Neesam

Site Visit Date: 10 August 2022

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application form
Drawing no. 042-01 (Existing Plans & Elevations)
Drawing no. 042-02 (Proposed Plans & Elevations)

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20161022	Erection of a single storey rear and side extension.	Permitted	06.12.2016
20140241	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of dormer extension in rear roof slope involving side extension to roof and conversion of roof space into a bedroom and ensuite shower room/wc.	Certificate Granted	23.05.2014

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014)

- CS01 – Sustainable Development
- CS02 – Scale and Distribution of Development
- CS12 – Green Infrastructure
- CS18 – Climate Change
- CS19 – Development and 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 well-designed places

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- SPG2 – Residential Layout Guidelines (2020)
- SPG4 – KCC Parking Standards (2006)
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021)
- Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard (2015)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Internal Consultees

GBC Highways

This proposal is complex as this is a property with sub-standard parking given current requirements, but it already exists so is considered acceptable for the existing dwelling. However, the applicant has clearly stated in the application the extension to the side is a self-contained property and as such must be considered as such, as with only minor modifications the existing and proposed dwellings could potentially become independent.

The existing dwelling requires two parking spaces, whilst the extension would be require one, but this would need to conform to the current requirements of 2.5 metres wide by 5 metres deep, or 6 metres if it is in front of the door to the property.

Providing the side extension is an annex ancillary to the occupation of the main dwelling there are no objections, as there is adequate parking, but if the extension were to be used as a separate dwelling, the proposal would be considered unacceptable as the car parking provision would not meet current standards. In addition, if planning permission were to be granted, a secure cycle parking space should be provided to comply with the requirements of SPG4 of one cycle space per bedroom.

Neighbouring properties

The application has been advertised by individual neighbour letters to 8 properties, and on site. The consultation periods expired on 11 August and 2 September 2022.

No letters of representation have been received from neighbouring properties.

Local Ward Councillors were also consulted, and no responses were received.

Officer's Analysis

Proposal

This application seeks permission for the erection of a side extension to provide a self-contained facility and a single storey rear extension.

The accommodation would include an additional unit of accommodation within the side extension across three floors, with a hall, WC and utility on the ground floor, and a separate set of stairs accessed by an internal door leading up to a kitchen and lounge/diner on the first floor and a bedroom and bathroom on the

second floor.

The single storey rear element will contain a family and dining area.

Principle of Development

The proposal for the works to the side of the property which are intended to provide a 'self-contained facility' has been submitted as a householder development, and described as an extension, and could reasonably form ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling, though the intended use of the accommodation has not been made clear.

There is no proposed separate external access to the accommodation, but internally the accommodation would appear to be a fully separate unit, with an internal door from the main hallway of the dwelling leading to a separate staircase accessing the 'self-contained' unit, which would essentially provide a wholly separate unit of accommodation including a bedroom, bathroom, kitchen, and lounge/diner. The use of the facility would not appear to be incidental to the main dwelling as it would not require any shared facilities with the main house.

The proposal has been assessed as a householder development but there would be issues with any potential separation of the 'self-contained facility'.

It is important to safeguard and make the best use of the existing housing stock in Gravesham. Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy 2014 relates to the scale and distribution of development in the Borough, and states that the development strategy is to retain and improve the existing housing stock. In the preamble to Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy 2014 (Housing Type and Size), paragraph 5.10.6 states that the Council will protect existing family-sized housing such as the application property to ensure that a sufficient number of such units are maintained, due to a recognised need for such housing.

Saved Policy H5 of the Local Plan 1994 seeks to accommodate the growing numbers of smaller households and provide low-cost accommodation, while taking into consideration the character and amenity of existing housing areas where single family occupancy is the norm. The area surrounding the application site is largely made up of single-family dwellings; any proposal to vary from this would be considered out of character.

Design, Character and Appearance

Section 12 of the NPPF 2021 relates to achieving well-designed places and sets out the Government's requirements in relation to design issues. Paragraph 126 emphasises the importance of achieving high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF 2021 seeks to ensure that development will add to the quality of an area, be visually attractive, and sympathetic to local character and history. Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 reflects these aims and requires that new development is well designed and respects the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The properties on Truro Road consist of a mix of mid-20th century terraced and semi-detached properties built on good size plots. 47 Truro Road is an end of terrace property, which has been previously extended with a hip to gable roof extension and dormer in the rear roof slope granted under application 2014024, and a single storey side addition forming an entrance porch.

The property's front garden has been replaced with hardstanding with enough space for two vehicles to park.



The extent of additions proposed at the property are considered to be excessive. The incorporation of the existing rear dormer into an extension at first floor level is of a particularly poor design and would give the property the appearance of three storeys with a flat roof at the rear. This would also result in a bulky appearance at the side. Whilst it would have a set back from the front elevation, the roof over the two storey side extension would not be subservient to the main roof so that the extension appears large in scale in comparison to those properties within the terrace.

Proposed elevations:



These aspects of the proposal are all contrary to the design advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide. Overall, the proposal would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its neighbouring counterparts.

There are no concerns with the single storey rear element of the proposal in terms of its design.

With regards to the character of this type of property along the road, which generally only have small-scale roof and rear additions, altogether this proposal is considered to comprise inappropriate extensions that are excessive, bulky and poorly designed, and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its neighbouring counterparts. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with the requirements of Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 130 of the NPPF 2021.

Residential Amenity

The NPPF 2021 states that planning decisions should aim to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users (paragraph 130f). The impact on amenity is also considered with regard to the criteria within Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014, 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.

Future Occupiers

It is considered that as a separate unit, the proposed self-contained facility would not comply with the Council's residential layout guidelines and the Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standards in terms of the size of the proposed accommodation. The proposed double bedroom within the facility is below standard at 9.4m². The lounge/diner is also below standard at 14m² (SPG2 requires 18m²), and the kitchen at 4m² (SPG2 requires 7.2m²). In addition, it is unacceptable to have an existing bedroom adjacent the proposed living room within the self-contained accommodation at first floor level; this would be likely to result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance for occupiers of the main dwelling.

Garden space around the property will be reduced by the proposed rear extension but the useable garden space would remain in excess of 10m deep and would exceed 100m² at approximately 136m². It would appear that the garden would be shared by both the existing dwelling and the self-contained facility, but this would result in a loss of privacy for the occupiers of the existing dwelling.

If the proposed annexe were to be severed from the main dwelling, which would be entirely possible given the position of the unit at the side of the main dwelling and the potential of a separate independent access to it, the amenity concerns would be significant. Given the small size of the proposed facility with substandard room sizes and an internal floor area of 35m², it would not adequately serve as an independent self-contained unit of accommodation on a long-term basis, as it is below the 58m² space required in the NDSS 2015 for a 1 bedroom, 2 person two storey dwelling.

There are therefore amenity concerns and conflict with the requirements of Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014, and the standards set out in the NDSS 2015 and SPG2 in respect of the accommodation standards for future occupants of the self-contained facility, particularly given the concern over the real possibility for the separation of the unit from the main house. It is not considered that a condition restricting the accommodation as ancillary would help prevent any adverse impacts on amenities.

Neighbouring Properties

The properties either side of the application site and likely to be affected by the proposals are the semi-detached property No. 45 to the north and the adjoining terraced property No. 49.

No. 45 is fairly well separated from the application property by its own side garden. As the proposed side extension would not project excessively to either the front or rear of the original house, and due to the separation distance between the two dwellings by over 7m from the closest point of the proposed extension, together with the oblique angle of No. 45, there would be no significant overshadowing, loss of light or outlook caused from the proposed side extension.

With regards to the single storey rear extension element of the proposal however, there are concerns about the amenity impact. This in particular relates to the proposed emergency staircase up to the roof of the proposed single storey rear extension, which has access onto it from the proposed double doors serving the living room of the proposed annexe facility within the side extension. There is also the potential for this at second floor level, with the extended dormer resting on the flat roof of the first floor extension. This would create a wholly unacceptable opportunity for overlooking neighbouring properties and would have a material and adverse impact on neighbouring privacy.

On this basis, the proposal would therefore harm the amenities of neighbouring properties, and as such, would fail to comply with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF 2021.

Parking and Highways

There would be an additional bedroom at the property as a result of the proposal. As a 5 bedroom property the parking requirement would be 3 spaces. However, the property has existing parking for at least 2 cars that would be unaffected by the proposal (though these spaces do not technically comply with current parking space requirements). The site is also in a sustainable location. As an extension to the dwelling, the car parking provision would be acceptable.

However, a separate unit of accommodation on the site would require an additional space over what is existing, and this would not be able to be adequately provided within the existing driveway, which would be likely to result in additional off-street parking pressure.

It is therefore considered that there would be an adverse impact on parking provision from the proposal, contrary to Policies CS11 and CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 and Saved Policies T1 and P3 of the Local Plan 1994.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The proposed 'self-contained facility' would not be for use incidental to the main dwelling due to the potential for forming a wholly separate unit of accommodation with its own independent access, which together with an inadequate standard of accommodation for future occupants, and privacy, noise and disturbance issues for the existing dwelling, will be out of character in this area of single family dwellinghouses and have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of both properties. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with the requirements of saved Policy H5 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review 1994, Policies CS02, CS14 and CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

The proposed two storey side extension and extended rear dormer are considered to comprise inappropriate extensions that are excessive, bulky and poorly designed, and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing terraced dwelling and its neighbouring counterparts. The proposal would therefore 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.

The proposed self-contained facility would be likely to increase the pressure placed on parking in the area as a result of the increased demand and reduced capacity for parking at the site. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policies CS11 and CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and Saved Policy P3 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review 1994.

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

Case Officer:	Mrs Katherine Parkin	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:	<i>K. Parkin</i>	Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	13th September 2022	Dated:	13th September 2022