

Penfold Project Services

“EPMARKET”, WROTHAM ROAD, MEOPHAM, KENT, DA13 0JH

Telephone: 01474 816690

e-mail: apenfold448@btinternet.com

PLANNING STATEMENT **AUGUST 2023**

1 GABRIEL GARDENS, GRAVESEND, KENT, DA12 4QD

ERECTION OF PART TWO STOREY AND PART SINGLE STOREY SIDE, FRONT AND REAR EXTENSION TO CREATE A NEW DWELLING; ERECTION OF TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSION TO EXISTING DWELLING, FORMATION OF TWO CAR PARKING SPACES IN THE FRONT GARDEN AND FORMATION OF VEHICLE ACCESS TO EXISTING PARKING AREA

BACKGROUND

A previous Planning Application reference 20230459 was refused on 13 July 2023.

The development as proposed was described as: -

Erection of part two storey and part single storey side, front and rear extension to create a new dwelling; erection of two storey front extension to existing dwelling, formation of two car parking spaces in the front garden and formation of vehicle access to existing parking area

The reasons for refusal were given as: -

- 1. The proposed development, by reason of its design, form and appearance, would be an overdevelopment of the application site, which would be incongruous and out of character with the existing building and its surroundings and would be detrimental to the appearance of the street scene. As such, the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 130 of the NPPF 2021 and Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014.*
- 2. The proposed development, by virtue of the inclusion of first floor windows in the rear elevation of the new dwelling and its proximity to the boundary with no. 2 Judeth Gardens, would lead to a detrimental level of overlooking and an unacceptable loss of privacy from that property. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupants of no. 2 Judeth*

Gardens and contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014, to Paragraph 130(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and to the RLG.

- 3. The proposal would make insufficient provision for the parking of cars within the site in accordance with the Borough Council's adopted Vehicle Parking Standards and would be likely to lead to cars parking on the public highway, inconvenient to other road users and detrimental to highway safety. As such, the proposal would be contrary to 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.*
- 4. The proposal would fail to safeguard biodiversity and fail to secure a contribution towards strategic mitigation measures within Special Protection Areas. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to paragraphs 180 and 181 of the NPPF 2021 and Policy CS12 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014.*

Further details for the reasons for refusal are incorporated within the Officer's Delegated Report dated 13 July 2023. The information provided within the Delegated Report forms the basis for the revised proposals and Planning Statement submitted with this application.

REVISED PROPOSALS

Following the issue of the refusal notice the reasons detailed in the Officers Delegated Report have been analysed and amendments to the proposals have been made

An amended application for planning approval is therefore submitted as follows: -

The first-floor layout has been altered to overcome the issues raised. Other than a minor increase in size of the two-storey front extension the layout of the ground floor remains unchanged.

The car parking arrangements for the new dwelling have also been Amended.

Amended documents submitted with this application are: -

- Full Plans application Form
- 101 - Plans and Elevations As Existing - A1
- 102A - Plans and Elevations As Proposed - A1
- 103A - Location Plan - A4
- 104B - Block Plans As Existing and As Proposed - A4
- Article 13 - Owner - KCC Crossover
- Notice Under Article 13
- Planning Statement

122 MARLING WAY

When considering this application, I would draw your attention to application reference 20221259 122 Marling Way.

A previous application reference 20221024 for the *erection of a new dwelling, the consequent external alterations and incidental minor internal ground floor alterations to the existing property, and associated external works and car parking provision* was refused.

However, by making some relative minor amendments to the proposals a subsequent application reference 20221259 for *erection of a new dwelling, the consequent external alterations and incidental minor internal ground and first floor alterations to the existing property, and associated external works and car parking provision* was approved.

This site is less than 300m from the application site and was refused for similar reasons.

The reasons for the refusal were addressed and deemed satisfactory for an approval to be granted.

In addition, there are other developments at 89 Whinfall Way (Application No 20030470), 2 Ariel Close (Application No 20120312), 16 Challenge Close (Application No 20150646) and 62 Astra Drive (20160094) that have all been granted consent in the past.

RESPONSE TO MATTERS RAISED IN THE DELEGATED REPORT

Principle of Development

Policy CS02 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 prioritises development in the urban area as a sustainable location and seeks to achieve this by prioritising redevelopment and recycling of underused, derelict and previously developed land, predominately in Opportunity Areas located within Gravesend and Northfleet.

The application site lies within the urban area of Gravesend and is not subject to any specific local planning policies or constraints that restrict the principle of residential development, other than general policies that seek to protect the character of the area and the amenity of existing and future residents.

The proposal would result in the subdivision of an existing residential plot. In this respect there are no specific local planning policies which prohibit this form of development.

However, it is noted at a national level the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF 2021) seeks to address the issue of garden grabbing in paragraph 71 and states that 'plans should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area'.

It is considered that local adopted policies CS14 (Housing Type and Design), CS15 (Housing Density), and CS19 (Development and Design Principles) together provide an

assessment framework in line with the guidance provided by paragraph 71 of the NPPF 2021. Therefore, the proposal shall be assessed against these policies in the section below which covers design, character and appearance.

Housing Delivery

It has been recognised that: -

The application site is not an asset or area of particular importance as defined in paragraph 11(d)(i), and that the proposed development would provide one new market dwelling, which would represent a minimal increase in housing supply, which weighs in favour of the proposal

Design, Character and Appearance

Local residents have raised concerns that the proposal would be an overdevelopment of the application site and Shorne Parish Council considers that the proposed design and layout may not be suitable or achievable. This is unfounded and unproven and should be disregarded

The Report has already concluded that the extension to the opposite end of the terrace in which the application site is located (identified with an arrow), has already slightly undermined the settlement pattern in the wider urban area and should therefore be taken into consideration.

It also concludes that the proposed external facing materials and fenestration would match with the existing building and those in the surrounding area. The proposal would make effective use of the application site and provide an additional terraced dwelling in an area that is characterised by such development, which would be in line with Policy CS14 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and paragraph 125(c) of the NPPF.

Two Storey Front Extension

However, the considerations to the two-storey front extension need to be addressed

*The report states that the proposed front extension to the existing building, by virtue of its attachment to the front projection on the proposed dwelling, its roof design and its depth, would **not** be typical of existing two storey front extensions in the locality and would be a prominent feature in the street scene.*

I would contest this statement as Riverview Park has numerous examples of two storey front extensions either across two properties or even just one. This type of extension is of a particular characteristic of this area and typical examples appear within the street scene, I would suggest, of every street in Riverview Park.

Of these examples a number have received planning consent recently, and of these all are either 1.8m or longer in depth: -

Application No	Address	Depth of Extension (m)
20200689	89 Vigilant Way	2.35
20200690	87 Vigilant Way	2.35
20220917	9 Tamesis Strand	2.60

20230100	112 Vigilant Way	2.25
20230349	18 Cirrus Crescent	1.80

These haven't been considered to be "*incongruous and dominant feature of the street scene*".

The proposed front extension on the previous application was 1.8m but, due to the need to readdress the layout of the first floor the depth of the extension has been increased very marginally to 2.125m to allow a function use of Bedroom 3 as can be seen on the amended floor plans.

As will be seen from the drawings, this has no impact on the vehicle parking arrangements.

Impact on Street Scene

The report continues to state that the proposed development would comprise of large and bulky additions to the side, front and rear of the application building to create a new dwelling and would result in a side elevation that is widely visible in the street scene. The new dwelling would elongate the terrace, with an irregular shaped building, that wraps around the existing garage for no. 3 Gabriel Gardens, providing a blank façade at the entrance to the cul-de-sac and as such, would be incongruous and undermine the character of the existing building, the street scene and the existing pattern of development in the surrounding area.

However, it has already been acknowledged that the development at no 9 has already eroded this and this site is not in a prominent location within Riverview Park and specifically the side extension is tucked away from view and will therefore have minimal affect on the street scene of Gabriel Gardens

Amenity of Future Occupiers

Rear Access

In addition, the Report continues: -

- As an end of terrace, the proposed dwelling should include an external rear access. However, none would be provided and in addition, the existing rear access to the application property would be lost.
- However, the alleyway does not appear to be accessible from the application site at present and no ownership/rights of access information has been provided.
- The proposed development would result in the loss of an external access to the rear of the application property and the proposed dwelling would have no external rear access.

These statements are completely erroneous.

Rear access is available to all properties within this terrace and indeed to those in Judeth Gardens via the open alley. This access was available at the time of the Case Officer's site visit

Access is therefore available for the storage of refuse bins, etc within the rear gardens of all properties

Garden Size

The proposal would achieve appropriate density numerically, but it would result in an end of terrace dwelling with a smaller garden than surrounding end of terrace properties and as such, it would not respect local character. It later states that

However, it is generally the corner plots within the Riverview Park development that have larger gardens. As previously stated, this plot is not situated in a strategic location.

Also, the garden to the retained dwelling (no 1) reflects the layout and is of the same size as the other mid-terrace properties within the area.

Room Sizes

All room sizes are in accordance with NPPF

Neighbouring Amenity

Adverse Overlooking

In order to address the issues raised the layout of the first floor has been totally amended.

The rooms to the rear of the property are now the family bathroom and an en-suite shower room to bedroom 1. The windows to these rooms will therefore have obscured glass and have an openable casement more than 1700mm above the internal floor level.

No windows to habitable rooms will be within 26m of windows to other properties, adverse overlooking impacts have therefore been removed completely.

The Report has already concluded that, in terms of overshadowing and overbearing impacts, the proposed dwelling, by virtue of the design of the proposed development and due to the layout and orientation of the surrounding properties, would have no adverse impacts on the occupiers of any of the surroundings dwellings (except for the application property itself).

Noise and Disturbance

The Report concludes that, the proposed development would introduce a new dwelling at the application site, which would generate additional noise and disturbance (through increased comings and goings, external domestic activities etc). However, as a single property in a residential area, the increase in noise and disturbance would not be significant and would not be detrimental to the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers.

Parking and Highways

All issues regarding parking have been addressed.

The existing parking spaces for two cars for the existing dwelling (no1) will be retained and the vehicular crossover from Gabriel Gardens will be extended

One parking space will be provided in the front garden of the new dwelling with areas of planning to either side. A single garage with space for one car in front located on the opposite side of Gabrel Gardens will be made available and be included within the application site.

Ecology and Biodiversity

A SAMMS payment will be made

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

Various objections have been raised by neighbours but these have generally been responded to within the Delegated Report.

Conclusion & Recommendation

It is concluded that, as all reasons for the refusal of the previous application have been addressed this application should be granted approval.