



Delegated Report

Approval of Details Application

Application no: 20250946

Location: Tourmalane, 63 Old Watling Street Gravesend Kent

Description: Application for approval of condition 7, 11, 12 and 13 attached to planning permission reference number 20240097 relating to a Parking Management Plan and Cycle storage scheme, a Landscaping Plan, detailing both hard and soft landscaping for the entire site, full details of all boundary treatments, including their location, design, height and materials and full details of the refuse storage.

Applicant: Mr Ajay Sangha

Site Visit Date: N/A

Planning permission was granted for 'Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a replacement two storey house' under application ref. 20240097 on 25 March 2024. This was approved subject to conditions including condition nos. 7, 11, 12 & 13 which this application seeks to discharge.

The information which has been submitted is as follows:

- Application form;
- Drawing no. DKM/8815/01 Rev. 02 – Conditions (Landscaping & Boundary Treatment);
- Drawing no. DKM/8815/02 Rev. 03 – Conditions (Bike & Bin Store) P.O Outbuilding Added;
- Refuse Storage Statement;
- Boundary Treatment Statement;
- Landscaping Statement; and
- Parking Management & Cycle Store Statement.

It should be noted that a new outbuilding is shown on drawing no. Drawing no. DKM/8815/01 Rev. 02 and DKM/8815/01 Rev. 02 with an annotation stating 'Outbuilding (P.D) Max 2.5 high' but that this did not form part of the approved plans of ref. 20240097.

Analysis

Condition 7

Condition 7 is as follows:

Prior to occupation of the dwellinghouse hereby approved, a Parking Management Plan and Cycle storage scheme shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority detailing all parking provision and cycle storage to be used by the occupiers of the dwellinghouse approved. The scheme shall then be constructed in accordance with these approved details and completed, in its entirety, prior to first occupation of the development. Thereafter the vehicle and cycle parking shall be retained.

Reason: In order to ensure an acceptable levels of vehicle and cycle parking provision, in accordance with
CONDITION – Delegated Report (Blank)

adopted policies T1 and P3 of the Local Plan First Review 1994 and Policies CS11 and CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014.

In the delegated report for application ref. 20240097 it was explained that this condition was required as:

'Details of the parking arrangements have been supplied but this does not indicate the extent of hard/ soft landscaping. Whilst it appears that there is scope for the plot to accommodate the required space of 2 vehicles and 2-4 cycle spaces, it must be ensured that this space is made available. Therefore, where approved a condition would be included requiring submission and approval of a parking plan and ongoing compliance with the approved documents and landscaping'.

In the information submitted the proposed block plan shows that there would be 4 parking spaces in the front garden, 3 on the eastern side and 1 to the west. This is considered to be a sufficient amount of parking spaces for this 5 bedroom dwelling.

For the cycle storage, space is to be provided in a proposed new outbuilding in the south eastern corner of the front garden. The outbuilding would be 3m in width, 4m in length and 3.5m to the top of the ridgeline of the pitched roof with double doors, tiled doors and unknown wall material.

This proposed outbuilding would require planning permission in itself (as a building on land forward of a wall forming the principal elevation) and is not something which can be dealt with under this approval of details application. It would need to go through the application process with neighbours consulted and the planning merits of the proposal assessed including design, character and appearance and neighbouring amenity. Therefore, although there is cycle storage shown, this is not sufficient to discharge condition 7 as the proposed bin and cycle store requires planning permission in its own right.

In summary, due to the fact that a building is proposed for the cycle storage which would require planning permission in itself and which cannot therefore be dealt with under this approval of details application, unacceptable information has been submitted in relation to condition 7 of ref. 20240097 and it cannot be discharged.

Condition 11

Condition 11 is as follows:

Prior to occupation of the dwellinghouse hereby approved, a Landscaping Plan, detailing both hard and soft landscaping for the entire site shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall then be constructed in accordance with these approved details and completed, in its entirety, prior to first occupation of the development. Thereafter the vehicle and cycle parking shall be retained.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the development and having regard to the location of the site within and adjacent to a conservation area and to provide satisfactory screening to neighbouring properties, in accordance with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and to ensure that the landscaping is established and maintained in the longer term.

In the information submitted it is shown that the front garden would have a tarmac vehicular crossover, several rows of granite cobbles across the vehicular access and then the main part of the front garden would be block paving with an edging slab. At the front to the sides of the vehicular access there would be planting, raised beds and a row of larch (evergreen) up to 1800mm. Details have been submitted showing the different sections. The following comments are made:

There is not enough soft landscaping proposed, the bulk of the front garden would be all hard paved with minimal soft landscaping proposed to the front garden. As one can see when they look at the streetscene that the site is situated in, it is standard that the majority of properties have a good amount of soft landscaping as well as the parking area. Those occasions where it is only all hardstanding or minimal hardstanding show the harm that is caused to the streetscene from this. As well as the unacceptability in terms of the predominance of hard paving the following comments are also made.

Apart from the larch (evergreen) there are no details on what the actual soft landscaping which is proposed

would be. There are no details of what the block paving would be – e.g. material, colour(s) and pattern. It is not clear what the dashed line is in the front garden – no annotation to identify it. No details of what the patio slab to the side and rear would be e.g. material, colour etc. The grass and vegetable patch to the rear is acceptable.

In summary, insufficient information has been submitted on some elements of the hard and soft landscaping and the amount of soft landscaping proposed in the front garden is minimal with an overabundance of hardstanding which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene. The proposed details are therefore contrary to Policy CS19 (LPCS) and condition 11 of ref. 20240097 cannot be discharged.

Condition 12

Condition 12 is as follows:

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, submitted documents and application form, before any above ground works commence, full details of all boundary treatments, including their location, design, height and materials, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved details before the dwellings hereby permitted are first occupied and thereafter maintained.

Reason: To protect and enhance the visual amenity and the character of the area and to ensure a satisfactory environment for existing and future residents in accordance with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014) and section 12 (Achieving well-designed places) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

The submitted information shows the boundary treatments would be as follows:

Front boundary - 900mm brick wall with metalwork on the top to an overall height of 1.8 with 2m piers and a 1.8m tall gate in the centre with an overall width of 5m across the vehicular access.

Eastern side boundary - 1.8m close boarded fence.

Western side boundary – starting from the rear to the front there would be a 1.8m wall with 2m piers, 1.8m timber side gate and then a 900mm wall with railings or timber panels above to an overall height of 1.8m and 2m piers.

Rear boundary - The existing 1.8 fence panels and single gravel board will be replaced with new identical panels and posts.

The following comments are made:

The proposed 1.8m high wall, railings and gates and 2m piers along the front boundary are unacceptable.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024) 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 139 of the NPPF (2024) 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 (LPCS) 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 front boundary treatments, the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) sets out that they should;

- Respond to the design of the dwelling;
- Be consistent with the height of other enclosures on the road;
- Avoid the introduction of different styles along the street. Treatments should reinforce the dominant boundary type along the street, ensuring consistency with the style and age of the property;
- Consider well-maintained planting as an alternative solution and retain any hedgerow;
- Encourage natural surveillance of the street and help design out crime;
- Incorporate visibility splays and sight lines for pedestrian and vehicular safety; and
- Hedges are also encouraged given their air quality benefits.

The existing front boundary treatment comprises a low wall, pier and gates. The front boundary treatments in the area surrounding the application site are mainly characterised by low walls and vegetation. Although there are examples of gates such as proposed here further down the road to the east at Highways (no planning history), Mayberry (ref. 20130519) and Southview (no planning history) these are not considered to provide justification here. Two have no history of planning permission for them and since 2013 at a local and national level, planning policy has put much greater importance on good design and such high wall, railings and gates would be unlikely to be permitted now under current local and national planning policy. The agent references Santana (ref. 20250062) this property is in Watling Street and not even in the road the application site is, it therefore does not form part of the streetscene the application site is located in and therefore there is no basis for justification here.

In terms of the eastern side boundary, whilst the 1.8m close boarded fence is considered acceptable in principle, it is not acceptable to have it coming all the way up to the front boundary at a height of 1.8m. That height is acceptable for fencing further back along a side boundary line but not at the front, this should drop down to a lower height. The fencing along the eastern side boundary of the property does this now and that is the case at the majority of other properties in the streetscene too. The fencing proposed with the 1.8m high section towards the front right up to the front boundary would be harmful to the character and appearance and would also be overbearing and unneighbourly to the neighbouring property to the east Kateshga.

With regards the west side boundary treatment the same comments apply. Whilst the overall 1.8 high wall and railings/fence on top with 2m piers is acceptable for the back part, the proposal to have 1.8m wall and railings at the front part right up to the front boundary is not acceptable for the same reasons as stated above. It would be harmful to the streetscene and would have an overbearing and unneighbourly impact on the dwelling to the west Ranmorene.

The replacement of the existing rear boundary treatment like-for-like is acceptable.

Overall, the proposed boundary treatments would be poorly designed and incongruous additions which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene and have an overbearing and unneighbourly impact on the neighbouring dwellings. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS19 (LPCS) and section 12 of the NPPF (2024).

Condition 13

Condition 13 is as follows:

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, submitted documents and application form, prior to occupation of the dwellinghouse hereby approved, full details of the refuse storage, including position, and scaled elevations, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall then be constructed in accordance with these approved details and completed, in its entirety, prior to first occupation of the development. Thereafter the refuse storage shall be maintained in accordance with the details approved pursuant to this condition.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of occupiers of adjoining and nearby residential properties and in accordance with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

The refuse storage is shown to be in the proposed new building in the south eastern corner of the front garden where there is clearly space for the refuse and recycling bins. However, as for the cycle store details for condition 7 above, the proposed outbuilding for the refuse store would require planning

permission in itself (as a building on land forward of a wall forming the principal elevation) and is not something which can be dealt with under this approval of details application. It would need to go through the application process with neighbours consulted and the planning merits of the proposal assessed including design, character and appearance and neighbouring amenity. Therefore, although there is refuse storage shown, this is not sufficient to discharge condition 13 as the proposed bin and cycle store requires planning permission in its own right.

The agent makes reference to an outbuilding approved at Santona under ref. 20250062. This property is in Watling Street and not even in the road the application site is, it therefore does not form part of the streetscene the application site is located in and therefore there is no basis for justification here. There are other outbuildings in the front gardens of properties in this road, such as at Mayberry and an outbuilding may or may not be ok but that is not to be assessed in this approval of details application, but in a planning application.

In summary, due to the fact that a building is proposed for the refuse storage which would require planning permission in itself and which cannot therefore be dealt with under this approval of details application, unacceptable information has been submitted in relation to condition 13 of ref. 20240097 and it cannot be discharged.

Conclusion

It is considered that insufficient and unacceptable information has been submitted to discharge condition nos. 7, 11, 12 & 13 of planning permission reference number 20240097.

Recommendation:

Refusal of Details

See draft Decision

Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:	<i>Rebecca Harrison</i>	Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	23rd February 2026	Dated:	23rd February 2026