



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20221288

Location: 36 The Sandpipers Gravesend Kent DA12 5QB

Description: Alterations and extensions to include a single-storey replacement porch at the front and a two-storey extension at the rear to replace the existing conservatory.

Applicant: Mr & Mrs A Sanghera

Site Visit Date: 24 January 2023

Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application form;
- Drawing no. 534/01 – Location Plan;
- Drawing no. 534/02 – Site Plan As Existing;
- Drawing no. 534/03 – Plans As Existing
- Drawing no. 534/04 – Elevations As Existing;
- Drawing no. 534/PL01 – Site Plan As Proposed;
- Drawing no. 534/PL02 – Plans As Proposed;
- Drawing no. 534/PL03A – Elevations As Proposed; and
- Design Statement.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
19840393	Erection of 100 dwellings with car parking and garages associated earthworks and laying out of access road onto Hillside Avenue and Old Road East.	Permitted	22.11.1984

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

- CS01 – Sustainable Development
- CS02 – Scale & Distribution of Development
- CS12 – Green Infrastructure
- CS19 - Development & Design Principles

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards
- TC7 – Other Archaeological Sites

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

- SPG2 - 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);
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021).

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

Environmental Protection

This application site falls within the buffer of the Holyoake Mount historic landfill site. Information gleaned from other applications within this street indicate that a protective capping layer of 750mm clean soil was placed in all gardens. It is assumed this was completed and a letter from the developer to the initial property buyers states that they should not dig below 2'6" in the gardens as this is the depth of protective material.

Construction workers will therefore need to be informed about the potential for contaminated material below this capping layer.

The following conditions should be applied which are in keeping with conditions placed on similar permission in this area.

- The applicant shall undertake a watching brief during construction in case any contamination is encountered during the groundwork phase. Workers on site during construction should be advised by the applicant that there is a possibility of finding contaminated material. If during development any contamination is found, the Local Planning Authority should be informed as soon as practical and the work shall not continue until written agreement is provided by the Local Planning Authority as to the appropriate measures to be taken to resolve the matter and they are satisfied that those measures have been carried out.

Any material brought onto the site must be suitable for use and the results of chemical analysis of this material to demonstrate that it is free from contamination and suitable for the proposed end use shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

In addition, material for off-site disposal should be dealt with appropriately as determined by a waste classification assessment. Appropriate documentation relating to the removal of material from site should also be forwarded to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason To ensure that the development is adequately protected against contaminated material and the management of soil decontamination can be adequately controlled.

- Prior to the works commencing on site, details of a gas impermeable membrane should be

submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The gas impermeable membrane shall be incorporated within the structure along with a ventilated sub-floor area. Any services entering/leaving the structure should be located above the gas impermeable membrane or adequate seals will have to be provided if the membrane has to be breached. The development shall be built in accordance with the approved plans and details.

Reason To ensure that the development is adequately protected against contaminated material and the management of soil decontamination can be adequately controlled.

KCC Heritage

Although the site is within area of archaeological potential I consider it unlikely that these works would have a significant below-ground archaeological impact and would not recommend the need for any archaeological works in this case.

Neighbouring properties

4 surrounding properties were consulted plus site notice – the overall consultation expiry date was 6 January 2023 - one response received in support with no comments made.

Officer's Analysis

The application site consists of a two storey detached dwelling situated on the eastern side of The Sandpipers. The site is located in an Area of Archaeological Potential and the Holyoake Mount and Pine Avenue Historic Landfill Site Buffer Zone.

The proposal is for alterations and extensions to include a single-storey replacement porch at the front and a two-storey extension at the rear to replace the existing conservatory.

The existing front porch measures 3.7m in width, 1.2m in depth and 3.6m in height to the top of the ridge. The proposed front extension would be 4.9m in width, 2.4m in depth and 3.2m in height to top of the ridge. It would have a door in the front and a window in the south flank elevation serving a wc. The extension would be rendered to match existing.

At the rear there is an existing conservatory which is 4.3m in width, 3.1m in depth and 3.5m to the highest point. This would be removed and the proposed two storey rear extension would be full width of the rear of the dwelling - 8.7m, 3.4m in depth and 7m in height to the top of the ridgeline. In the rear elevation it would have sliding doors at ground floor and two windows at first floor serving a bedroom each. There would be no openings in either flank elevation. The extension and the entire first floor of the whole dwelling is proposed to be faced with Cedral cladding in light grey, at ground floor facing brick would be used and matching roof tiles.

The principle considerations in the assessment of the application are:

- Design, Character and Appearance
- Amenity of Future Occupiers
- Neighbouring Amenity
- Parking and Highway Safety

Design, Character and Appearance

Front porch extension

The Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) sets out the design requirements in respect of two storey rear extensions:

- **Design:** Front extensions must be designed to respond to and enhance the character of the existing dwelling and street.
- **Scale:** The scale and design of new porches should respond to the existing dwelling.
- **Existing Features:** Care should be taken to preserve the appearance of existing features, such as bay windows, and avoid porches that would impact these by subsuming their form or erasing their prominence. Existing porches that are open to the street, and are an original feature that form part of a local pattern of development, should generally not be enclosed.
- **Car Parking:** Extensions or porches should not result in the retention of front parking spaces of inadequate depth.

In this case there is an existing front porch (original to the dwelling) which it is proposed to remove. The majority of the dwellings in The Sandpipers have these front addition elements. It is proposed to remove this and replace with a new front extension. Although larger in width and depth - 1.2m greater in width and 1.2m greater in depth, it would still be a modest extension and the height would be 400mm less. There are also a couple of dwellings which have larger front additions such as nos. 28 and 45 (ref. 20040238). The proposed front extension is therefore considered to be in keeping with the scale and character of the host dwelling and the streetscene and would not cause any harm to it.

Two storey rear extension

The Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) sets out the design requirements in respect of two storey rear extensions:

- **Depth:** The extension does not dominate the original property. This can cause the site to appear overdeveloped, and cause long dark internal spaces to be formed. Extensions to extensions will generally not be supported.
- **Height:** two storey extensions can have very significant impact on neighbouring amenity, so should generally not be built up to site boundaries with neighbouring gardens / properties.
- **Width:** Extensions should not be of greater width than the original building.
- **Design:** Taller extensions are of greater visibility, and should incorporate roof designs to reflect, tie in with and not overwhelm the main property's roof. Patterns and proportions of windows should reflect the host building and local character.
- **Materials:** Using matching external materials and window / door frames is especially relevant for two storey extensions.
- **Overlooking:** Extensions should avoid inserting any flank windows, or involve raised platforms where they would allow new, or increased overlooking views into neighbouring gardens / properties.
- **Light / Outlook:** The 45 / 25 degree rule will be used to assess the impact of the extension on neighbouring light / outlook.
- **Garden Space:** Adequate garden area for the enlarged house should be retained following development.

In this case the main depth of the host dwelling (minus the front porch and rear conservatory) has a depth of 5.4m and the extension would be 3.4m therefore the depth is considered to not dominate the original property. The height would be set down from the main ridgeline by 260mm and the extension would be set in from the southern side boundary by 900mm and set in from the northern side boundary by 2.5 – 2.7m (due to angled boundary). The extension would be the full width of the rear elevation but would not exceed the width of the original host building. The roof would be a double pitched M roof which as stated would be set down below the ridgeline and it would be in keeping with the pitched roof of the main dwelling and still

allow a large amount of the original rear roof slope of the dwelling to be visible. The materials would match the main dwelling, brick at ground floor and cladding at first floor of which the first floor of the host dwelling is also to be re-clad in; Although the majority of the dwellings are still their as built red brick facing, there are a couple of dwellings which have been faced with cladding at first floor, these are nos. 21 & 42 The Sandpipers and the cladding is therefore considered acceptable; matching roof tiles would be used and overall the facing materials are considered to be sympathetic. Overall therefore the proposed two storey rear extension is considered acceptable in terms of design, character and appearance and would not cause harm to the character of the dwelling or the streetscene.

In respect of design, character and appearance the proposal is considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Amenity of Future Occupiers

Garden Size

SPG2 - Residential layout guidelines including Housing Standards Policy Statement October 2015 Adopted 1996 – amended June 2020 states the minimum sizes for minimum garden area and minimum depth from rear of house depending on the number of bedrooms a property has:

Accommodation with :	Minimum garden area (sq. metres)	Minimum depth from rear wall of house (metres)
1-2 bedrooms	37.2	7.6
3 bedrooms	60.0	10.0
4 or more bedrooms	100.0	10.0

In this case the property is currently a three bedroom property and meets the minimum garden area and depths as follows:

- Existing garden area = 96.4 sq. m
- Existing depth from rear wall of house = Ranges from 9.5m to 10.8m (due to angled rear boundary line)

The proposal would result in the both the garden area and depth becoming undersized however, as follows:

- Proposed garden area = 78.9 sq. m
- Proposed depth from rear wall of house = Would range from 6m to 7.2m (due to angled rear boundary line)

The garden area would be undersized by 17.5 sq. m and the rear garden depth would be undersized by 2.8m at its longest depth.

It is noted that permitted development rights were not withdrawn under the original permission for the housing estate under ref. 1984039. As such the applicant could erect a full width extension across the rear of the dwelling up to 4m in depth under permitted development which would be a deeper extension than that proposed here (3.4m in depth) and would result in the property having an even more undersized garden area and depth than shown here. The applicant could potentially also construct an extension up to 8m in depth under the prior approval process although to be deemed lawful the extension would have to meet other limitations set out in Class A, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended); confirmation of which could be given through a Lawful Development Certificate. The property already has an existing conservatory at the rear and the proposed extension would effectively be expanding that footprint across the rest of the rear dwelling, so it is essentially only half of the footprint of the proposed extension that would be new footprint. Although small the garden is considered to be of a sufficiently sized space for the provision of adequate outdoor storage, leisure use, clothes drying and play space. The existing shed will be removed under the proposed development which would provide more useable garden area. Paragraph 10 of SPG2 - Residential layout guidelines does state that in exceptional circumstances it may be appropriate for the minimum garden

depths and areas to be modified and in these cases each case will be considered on its individual merits having particular regard to any exceptional circumstances and all other material considerations. The property does also have a front garden which although not private amenity space, it is still amenity space that the property has and given that the property is located at the end of a cul-de-sac this front garden is considered to account for a slightly more useable garden space than the average front garden.

It is therefore considered that for these reasons as set out above the undersized area and depth would be acceptable on this occasion and that refusal of this application on the ground of an undersized garden area and depth would be unlikely to stand up at appeal.

Contamination

The site is located in both the Holyoake Mount and Pine Avenue Historic Landfill Site Buffer Zones. As such it must be ensured that any works do not disturb any existing protection against landfill gas. Environmental Protection (Regulatory Services) have advised of two conditions which would need to be attached (see comments).

Subject to these conditions (one of which is pre-commencement and the applicant has confirmed can be attached) it is therefore considered occupiers would be sufficiently protected from any contamination.

Bedroom Sizes

There would be two new bedrooms in the rear extension, one would be 9.1 sq. m and the other would be 15.2 sq. m. The Technical Housing Standards (2015) state that a single bedroom should be a minimum of 7.5 sq. m and a double bedroom should be a minimum of 11.5 sq. m. In this case the smaller bedroom would achieve the minimum standard for a single bedroom and the larger bedroom would achieve the minimum the minimum standard for a double.

Overall therefore, it is considered that subject to the protection conditions in respect of land landfill contamination then in respect of amenity of occupiers the proposal is considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Neighbouring Amenity

Front extension

Due to the scale of the front extension and its depth from any neighbouring properties it would cause no impact with regards overshadowing or loss of outlook. The wc. window could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut apart from top hung opening 1.7m above floor level, should permission be forthcoming in order to ensure there would be no impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property to the south, no. 37 The Sandpipers.

Two storey rear extension

To denote overshadowing the extension would need to project beyond the 45 degree line from the centre point of a neighbours window on both plan and elevation. In terms of the two nearest openings on the rear of no. 37 The Sandpipers to the south, the proposed extension would not fail the 45 degree line on both plan and elevation from either the nearest ground floor doors or the nearest first floor level window on the rear of no. 37. As such it is considered there would be no overshadowing or loss of light; there would also be loss of outlook. There are no windows proposed in the south flank elevation of the extension therefore no overlooking. There is a new window proposed in the original south flank elevation of the dwelling at first floor level to serve a bathroom. As this is a non-habitable room should permission be forthcoming a condition could be attached to state that the window shall be obscure glazed and fixed shut apart from top hung opening 1.7m above floor level in order to protect the amenity of the occupiers of no. 37.

Due to a triple garage block to the north of the dwelling there is a large gap between the application

dwelling and the neighbour to the north, no. 35 The Sandpipers. Due to the distance between the north flank wall of the extension and the south flank elevation of no. 35 of some 8.7m there would be no impact on this property with regards overshadowing or loss of light and as there are no windows proposed in the north flank elevation of the extension there would be no overlooking.

Overall therefore subject to conditions in respect of neighbouring amenity the proposal is considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Parking and Highway Safety

The property is currently three bedrooms and would increase to four bedrooms. It has a detached garage and drive in front with space for one vehicle, making two spaces in all. SPG4 states that properties with four or more bedrooms should have a maximum of three spaces per dwelling. As such it is considered the property would still retain a sufficient level of off-street parking and in respect of parking and highway safety the proposal is therefore considered compliant with saved Policy P3 (LPFR).

Archaeology

The site is located within an Area of Archaeological Potential however, KCC Heritage have confirmed that it is unlikely that the proposal would have a significant below-ground archaeological impact and they therefore do not recommend the need for any archaeological works in this case. In respect of archaeology the proposal is therefore considered to not raise any issues with regards saved Policy TC7 (LPFR).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

None.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposal is considered acceptable in respect of design, character and appearance, occupier amenity, neighbour amenity, parking and highway safety and archaeology. As such it is considered that the proposal subject to conditions would be compliant with local and national planning policy.

Recommendation: Permission

(For detailed conditions and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison	Team Leader:	Miss Faye Hobbs
Signed:	<i>Rebecca Harrison</i>	Signed:	
Dated:	27th January 2023	Dated:	30 January 2023