

Steve Baker **Architect**

78 Pound Road East Peckham
Tonbridge Kent TN12 5BJ

18 Hatton Place
London EC1N 8RU

T: +44 (0)1622 870275
M : +44 (0)7967 639566
E : contact@stevebakerarchitect.com
W : www.stevebakerarchitect.com

23rd October 2024

Gravesham Borough Council
Planning Department
Civic Centre
Gravesend
Kent DA12 1AU

Dear Sir/Madam

A22050 – Peach Croft, Gravesend
Our reference – A22050.1/241023/GBC/SJB

On behalf of our Clients, D and K Partridge and J and C Cassidy, we confirm the submission online today of a Householder planning application, Planning Portal reference PP-13499176, for proposed works at the existing residential property at 18 Peach Croft Gravesend Kent DA11 8ST, comprising in addition to this covering letter:

- Completed application form,
- 1000 Location Plan Rev B,
- 1001 Existing Site Block Plan Rev B,
- 1010 Existing Ground Floor Plan Rev B,
- 1011 Existing First Floor Plan Rev B,
- 1012 Existing Roof Plan Rev B,
- 1020 Existing Section AA Rev B,
- 1030 Existing North Elevation Rev B,
- 1031 Existing South Elevation Rev B,
- 1032 Existing East Elevation Rev B,
- 1033 Existing West Elevation Rev B,
- 1101 Proposed Site Block Plan Rev B,
- 1110 Proposed Ground Floor Plan Rev B,
- 1111 Proposed First Floor Plan Rev B,
- 1112 Proposed Roof Plan Rev B,
- 1120 Proposed Section AA Rev B,
- 1121 Proposed Section BB Rev B,
- 1130 Proposed North Elevation Rev B,
- 1131 Proposed South Elevation Rev B,
- 1132 Proposed East Elevation Rev B, and
- 1133 Proposed West Elevation Rev B.

The proposed works comprises a two-storey side and a single-storey rear extensions, and the associated external and internal alterations.

This application has been prepared following the refusal to grant planning consent for previous proposals, reference 20231200, the subsequent dismissed appeal, reference APP/K2230/D/24/3338743, and Pre-Application Enquiry (PAE), reference 20240148.

The stated reasons for refusal for the previous application, reference 20231200, comprise:

- 1. The proposed two storey side extension fails to constitute good design, lacks subservience and constitutes an incongruous addition which fails to respect the scale of the host dwelling. In conjunction with the scale of the two storey side extension the single storey side extension would further increase the footprint of the dwelling thus resulting in excessive bulk and massing and over development of the site contrary to the requirements of CS19 local Plan Core Strategy 2014, SPD4 - Householder Alterations and Extensions Guidance (2021) and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.*
- 2. The proposal will result in an unacceptable and cramped amenity space for future occupiers and would therefore fail to provide a high standard of amenity for future users, which would conflict with the requirements of the SPG2 Residential Layout Guidelines (2020), Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 135f of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.*

The stated reasons for the dismissal of the subsequent respective appeal, reference APP/K2230/D/24/3338743, comprise:

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 4 "Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021)" requires extensions to dwellings to be subordinate to that of the host dwelling. To achieve this the Guide illustrates that the extension is to be stepped back from the front building line of the original dwelling and roofs are to be stepped down from the ridge of the host dwelling.

4. The proposed side extension, having a matching front building line and roof ridge to that of the host property, would not satisfy the requirements of the Guide. As such, the extension would not be a subservient addition to the host dwelling, as required by SPD 4.

5. The Guide also requires the width of an extension to be no greater than the width of the host building. The side extension would be almost the same width as the original dwelling.

6. Taking these matters collectively, the proposal would not be a subservient addition to the host dwelling. Furthermore, given its overall size, it would have an appearance of an additional dwelling attached to the host property, rather than appearing as an extension to the existing dwelling house.

7. The rear extension would span across both the rear of the original dwelling and that of the side extension. When considered in conjunction with the two storey side extension the Council have calculated that the proposed extensions would add an additional 55.69sqm to the original 33.96sqm footprint of the original dwelling. This would not respect the scale of the host dwelling.

8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policy CS19 of the Local Plan Core Strategy 2014, SPD 4 and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) 2023. This policy, SPD 4 and the Framework seek, amongst other matters, development to be visually attractive, conserve and enhance the character of the local built environment and to integrate well with the surrounding local area.

9. No. 14 Peach Croft hosts a two-storey side extension that extends along the principal frontage elevation of that property. I have been provided various documents and details relating to planning permissions at No. 14 from between September 1987 up until December 2008. Photographs of No. 14 as it is now have also been provided. It is also suggested that the proposed rear extension is wholly consistent with, and less substantial than, the rear extensions granted planning permission to Nos 14 and 15 Peach Croft. Planning details relating to a planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension at No. 15 have also been provided.

10. Those planning permissions relating to No. 14 predate the 2014 Local Plan Core Strategy, and all those planning permissions predate the 2021 SPD and the 2023 Framework. The proposal can and should be considered against the current development plan and guidance that is in place.

11. An extension could be provided under Permitted Development rights, albeit the existence of permitted development does not make the development more acceptable, nor does it justify the harm that I have identified above.

Living environment

12. The Council has adopted residential layout guidelines for garden sizes and depths (SPG 2 "Residential Layout Guidelines (June 2020)"). Post development the Council have calculated that the rear garden area would be of a size approximately 36.51sqm and have a maximum depth of around 3.07m, which is said to be significantly below the Council's minimum standards for residential gardens.

13. The appellant contends that the correct figures for the rear garden are 103sqm (area) and 10.15m (depth) and comments that the proposed rear extension would maintain a minimum 100sqm rear garden area and 10m depth as sought for new 4-bed residential dwellings in accordance with the Council's SPG 2. Looking at the proposed site block plan, drawing reference 1101, which has been included within the Council's delegated report, that plan annotates the garden area to be 103sqm and to be 10.15m deep post rear extension. It, therefore, appears to me that the resulting size of the rear garden would accord with the Council's adopted SPD 2.

14. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the standards of living environment for its future occupiers. The proposal would, therefore, not conflict with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014, SPG 2 (2020), and paragraph 135f of the Framework 2023.

Conclusion

15. Whilst I have found in favour of the appellant in terms of the second main issue, this does not overcome the identified harm in relation to the first main issue.

16. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

The PAE response concluded:

Summary

As it currently stands, it is unlikely that the Council would support this proposal if an application was submitted. Please be advised to refer to the Council's SPD4 – Householder Alterations and Extensions Guidance (2021) when considering any future proposal as well as taking into account the comments in the appeal decision. Please also be advised that an extension similar to those at no. 7 and 20 Peach Croft would be looked up more favourably.

The revised proposals comprising this application wholly responds to the stated reasons for the refusal to grant planning consent, for the subsequent dismissal at appeal, and, in particular, to the most recent PAE response. With due reference to the stated examples at Nos 7 and 20 Peach Croft in the latter, the proposals also wholly comply with the Gravesham BC 'Supplementary Planning Document Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide October 2021', and also, although not strictly applicable, with the Gravesham BC 'Supplementary planning guidance 2 Residential layout guidelines including Housing Standards Policy Statement October 2015 Adopted February 1996 - amended June 2020'.

The revised proposals have been developed with due regard to both local and national planning policy, with no unacceptable detrimental impact on any adjoining property and, as such, should therefore be considered favourably.

Should there be any further queries or concerns with any aspect of the revised proposals and this application, we would be pleased to review the proposed works with yourselves in order to achieve agreed and acceptable proposals prior to the determination of this application.

The respective application fee of £258 and the Planning Portal service charge of £70, both including VAT, will be paid separately and directly by the applicant.

We would be pleased to receive the following from you:

- Confirmation of receipt of this application, its validity, registration and that no further information is required,
- A receipt for the application fee,
- Confirmation of the timescale for the determination of this application.

We look forward to your acknowledgement of receipt of this application at your earliest convenience.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steve Baker', written over a horizontal line.

Steve Baker
BA(Arch)(Hons) B.Arch(Hons)(Reilly) ARB RIBA

Principal

For and on behalf of Steve Baker Architect

D: +44 (0)1622 870275

M: +44 (0)7967 639566

E: stevebaker@stevebakerarchitect.com

cc – D and K Partridge and J and C Cassidy

Enc

Our reference: A22050.1/241023/GBC/SJB