




Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20220777

Location: 21 Colyer Road Northfleet Gravesend Kent

Description: Demolition of existing detached single garage and rear conservatory and erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.

Applicant: Mr Scott Furlong

Site Visit Date: Previous application ref. 20220502 – 13 May 2022

Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application form;
- Drawing no. BDS2208 Sheet 1 Rev. A – Existing Elevations & Floor Plans;
- Drawing no. BDS2208 Sheet 2 Rev. A – Proposed Elevations & Floor Plans;
- Drawing no. BDS2208 Sheet 3 Rev. A – Location Plan;
- Drawing no. BDS2208 Sheet 4 Rev. A – Existing Site Plan; and
- Drawing no. BDS2208 Sheet 5 Rev. A – Proposed Site Plan.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20220502	Demolition of existing garage and conservatory and erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.	Refused	4 July 2022

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

- CS01 – Sustainable Development

- CS02 – Scale & Distribution of Development
- CS12 – Green Infrastructure
- CS18 - Climate Change
- CS19 - Development & 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 sustainable development and 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); and
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021).

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

None.

Neighbouring properties

4 surrounding properties were consulted plus a site notice – overall consultation expiry date was 12 August 2022 – no responses received.

Officer's Analysis

Planning permission was refused for 'Demolition of existing garage and conservatory and erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension' in July 2022 (ref. 20220502) on the following ground:

1. *The proposed two storey side extension by virtue of its siting and design with it not being set back from the main front elevation of the host dwelling would result in an overly dominant addition which would not be subservient to the host dwelling and would unbalance the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached dwellings and also be harmful to the streetscene. As such this proposal is contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).*

It therefore needs to be seen whether this current application for 'Demolition of existing detached single garage and rear conservatory and erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension'

has resolved this ground of refusal.

Design, Character and Appearance

The application dwelling consists of a modest two storey semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof. The dwelling sits on a roughly triangular plot with a distance of 6.3m from the centre of the south flank elevation to the property. This distance increases towards the front of the front and decreases towards the rear due to the angled southern boundary line of the site. To the south is a vehicular accessway which leads through to Vale Road and which serves a number of businesses. Beyond this to the south is a large expanse of green space, there is therefore a large gap in built form between the southern flank of the application dwelling and the northern flank of the nearest neighbouring dwelling in Colyer Road to the south (some 163 metres away).

The Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) states that two storey side extensions should appear subservient to the host building by lying behind the main front building line, though where designed well or having regard to positive local character, other approaches can be supported. The height should not exceed the eaves height of the host building. The width should generally be no greater than half the width of the host building. The existing rhythm of the street, including for example characteristic gaps between properties, the symmetry of pairs of semi-detached homes or groups of terraced houses, should not be unreasonably interrupted. A minimum gap of 1 metre should be retained between the extension and the flank boundary. Due to the greater visibility of two storey side extensions they should incorporate roof designs to reflect and generally be subservient to the main property's roof. The use of flat or false pitched roofs visible from the street should be avoided. Patterns of windows should reflect the host building and local character. Walls to extensions should not form the site boundary with the public highway, as these can be oppressive and encourage antisocial activities. Matching external materials and window / door frames should be used.

In the previous refused application the two storey side extension was to be built in line with the front wall of the dwelling and therefore not set back as advised in order to achieve a subservient appearance. In this current proposal the ground floor of the two storey side extension would be built in line with the part of the front wall of the dwelling which contains the front door and the first floor level would be set by front wall of the dwelling by 900mm. This is now considered a sufficient set back at first floor level; it is considered acceptable that the ground floor level is built in line with the front wall. The extension would be set down from the ridgeline of the host dwelling and the eaves would be in line with the eaves line. Its width would be 3.3m so therefore only 400mm greater than half the width of the host dwelling (which is 5.8m). Due to the large expanse of space to not only the southern boundary of the application site itself (ranging from 1.8m – 5.2m due to the angled boundary) but also further south due to large extent of green space beyond, there would be no loss of any gap between properties. The roof design would be hipped to match the main dwelling and the fenestration would match that in the main dwelling. The brick and tiles would match the main dwelling. In summary it is considered the proposed extension would now be a subservient addition, would not unbalance the pair of semi's and would be not be harmful to the streetscene.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be 2.5m in depth, extend across the majority of the rear elevation (set in 300mm from the southern flank) and would have a mono pitched roof. The extension would be modest in size and subservient to the host dwelling and the streetscene (rear is viewable from the rear accessway).

In respect of design, character and appearance the proposal is now considered acceptable and to have address the ground of refusal of application ref. 20220502 and in this regard the proposal is compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Amenity of Occupiers

Existing garden area – 13.9 sq. m (front) plus 82. 1 sq. m (rear) = 96 sq. m

Existing garden depth – 12.4m

Proposed garden area – 13.9 (front) plus 56.5 sq. m (rear) = 70.4 sq. m
Proposed garden depth – 10m

The dwelling would remain as a three bedroom dwelling, the proposed garden area and depth would still exceed the minimum garden area and depth as set out in SPG2.

The new bedroom formed in the proposed extension would be 11 sq. m in area which would be 0.5 sq. m off of the minimum standard for a double bedroom as set out in the Technical Housing Standard (2015) but this is not considered overly undersized.

In respect of the amenity of occupiers the proposal is considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Neighbouring Amenity

Due to the siting of the proposed two storey side extension on the southern elevation of the dwelling and there being no immediate neighbouring dwelling to the south there would be no impact on any neighbouring properties from the proposed two storey side extension.

Due to the very modest scale of the proposed single storey rear extension in terms of depth and height it would cause no impact on the amenity of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling no. 19 Colyer Road.

In respect of neighbouring amenity the proposal is considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Parking and Highway Safety

The dwelling would remain a three bedroom dwelling, the existing detached garage would be demolished. The existing parking area to the front of the dwelling can accommodate two vehicles which meets the maximum parking standards as set out in SPG4; the area would in any case be increased in size and would have space for two-three off street parking spaces. The proposal raises no parking or highway safety issues and in this respect the proposal would be compliant with saved Policy P3 (LPFR).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

None.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposal would now be acceptable in respect of design, character and appearance and as such has addressed the ground of refusal of application ref. 20220502. The proposal would also be acceptable in respect of occupier and neighbour amenity and parking and highway safety. As such permission is recommended.

(For detailed conditions and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:	<i>Rebecca Harrison</i>	Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	23rd August 2022	Dated:	23rd August 2022