



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Application No:	20230232
Location:	2 Poplar Walk, Meopham, Gravesend, Kent, DA13 0EB
Description:	Erection of a two storey infill side extension and erection of first floor extension over garage.
Applicant:	Mr William Deal
Site Visit:	2 nd May 2023

Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application Form - dated 09/03/2023;
- Ordnance Survey Site Location Plan (scale - 1:1250);
- Drawing no. 01 - Existing Elevations;
- Drawing no. 02 - Existing Ground Floor Plan;
- Drawing no. 03 - Existing First Floor Plan;
- Drawing no. 04 - Existing Roof Plan;
- Drawing no. 05 - Proposed Elevations;
- Drawing no. 06 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan;
- Drawing no. 07 - Proposed First Floor Plan;
- Drawing no. 08 - Proposed Roof Plan;
- Drawing no. 09 - Proposed Block Plan (scale - 1:200).

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20220118	Erection of a perimeter fence	REFUSED	07.04.2022
19600014	Site for erection of dwellings	PERMITTED	21.04.1960

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)

- Section 2 - Achieving Sustainable Development
- Section 12 - Achieving Well-Designed Places

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- SPG 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)
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021)
- Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment (2009)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Internal Consultees

GBC Highways Officer - This proposal raises some concerns as the existing garage will be demolished and a new one formed within the extended dwelling. SPG4 gives a preferred size of a garage as 5.5 metres long by 3.6 metres wide.

Garages

B2. Experience has shown that garages provided for individual residential dwellings are unlikely to be used for the parking of a vehicle unless sufficient space is also incorporated within the garage for storage. This may have less relevance for garages that are provided as a communal facility for residential accommodation. However, the needs of the mobility impaired, either as a driver or as a passenger, should also be considered in the design of garages and sufficient space should also be allowed to enable a garage to be used as a secure location for any cycle parking provision.

Taking these factors into account the preferred internal dimensions of a garage that should be considered for residential developments in Kent are:

Preferred Garage Size for Single Car	5.5m (length) x 3.6m (width)
Preferred Garage Size for Two Cars	5.5m (length) x 6.0m (width)

Where it can be demonstrated that cycle parking is provided elsewhere width of garage can be reduced.

This proposal falls well short of this, although it is accepted that this is a preferred size. However, for a practical garage the width should still be 2.9 metres with a clear internal length of 5 metres. Looking at the drawings this appears to require the garage to be widened, lengthened and the door to the utility room reversed to open away from the garage. The 400mm extra in width is to compensate for the space that would be borrowed from adjacent spaces in a standard car park layout. As presented, I cannot consider the

garage to be suitable as a parking space, so retain two parking spaces, which is also the minimum requirement for a four-bedroom property, two vehicles need to be accommodated on the drive. In addition a secure cycle parking space should be provided to comply with the requirements of SPG4 of one cycle space per bedroom.

As presented I can only recommend refusal due to inadequate car parking provision, or at least a condition should be imposed requiring a parking plan for two standard size parking spaces that does not include the garage.

External Consultees

Meopham Parish Council - The Parish Council objects to this planning application as if permitted the extension will have a disproportionate impact on the street scene and would constitute overdevelopment of the site.

Neighbouring properties

A notice was displayed on site 29th March 2023.

In addition, five surrounding properties were consulted and no representations were received. The consultation period expired 14th April 2023.

Officer's Analysis

2 Poplar Walk is a detached chalet style bungalow located on the corner of Poplar Walk and Denesway. The property has a driveway and detached garage to the rear, has fenced off garden area at the rear and an open frontage, with a low boundary wall.



Within the surrounding street scene there are a number of identical chalet style bungalows.

This application proposes the erection of a two storey rear extension and dormer extension. The extension would match the overall height of the dwelling, extending across to and over the existing garage. The dormer would occupy the entire rear roof slope of the extended dwelling. The extension would have the following dimensions:

Rear Extension

- Depth - 4.6m
- Width - 6.62m
- Height (max) - 7.1m
- Height (eave) - 3.25m

Dormer Extension

- Depth - 1.65m
- Width - 13.35m
- Height (max) - 1.9m

Existing Elevations



Proposed Elevations



The development would create space at ground floor for an enlarged kitchen and dining room, a new study and utility room, and an integral garage. At first floor level, space would be created for a new bedroom, family bathroom and ensuite.

Design, Character and Appearance

Policy CS19 (Development and Design Principles) of Gravesham's Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) states that new development will be visually attractive and locally distinctive, should conserve and enhance the character of the local built and natural environment and integrate well with the surrounding area. Moreover, Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) sets out that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Gravesham's Design Guidance SPD (2021) sets out key design principles for extensions, which should reflect and respect the original character of the property and respond to its features and should be subservient and subordinate. The SPD continues to address two storey rear extensions, stating that care should be taken to their depth and scale to avoid dominating the property or appear overdeveloped, their width should not exceed that of the original property, and their height should be carefully considered when they abut neighbouring properties boundaries. Furthermore, the guidance states that dormers can have harmful effects on roofscapes and that care should be taken to their massing to ensure that they do not overwhelm the roof.

The proposed rear extension has been designed with similar features to the existing dwelling, replicating the barn-hip and height. However, the extension is considered poor design by virtue of its dominating bulk and massing. The extension is large and would increase the depth of the property at two storey by 46.7%, almost doubling the depth and creating a disproportionately elongated property. It is not subservient or subordinate to the main dwelling and would add significant bulk to what is considered a well-proportioned property. Moreover, the scale and bulk of the extension is exacerbated by the lack of features and facade which is prominent from the street scene and considerably accentuates its depth. Similarly, the proposed dormer is excessive in scale, dominates and overwhelms the entire extended rear roof slope and is considered poor design. Therefore, the extensions hereby proposed fail to respect the scale and character

of the original dwelling and are considered overdevelopment.

As aforementioned, there are a number of similar chalet bungalows in the wider area and some have been extended. However, the scale of the extensions are minimal in comparison to those hereby proposed. A number of the other chalets have single storey rear extensions and some have two storey side extensions, but are at a significantly smaller scale to that hereby proposed. Moreover, the prominence of the application property on the corner plot requires a more careful approach due to impact on the street scene.

Overall, the proposed rear extension and dormer extension are disproportionate, bulky additions that fails to respect the character or scale of the property. The extension is not subordinate and dominates the original dwelling, while the scale of the dormer dominates the entire extended roof slope. Therefore the extensions hereby proposed are overdevelopment contrary to Gravesham's Design Guidance SPD (2021), Policy CS19 (Development and Design Principles) of Gravesham's Local Plan Core Strategy (LPCS) (2014) and Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021).

Amenity of Future Occupiers

There will be no impact on the amenity of future occupiers as a result of this development. As such, it is in accordance with Policy CS19 (LPCS) and Section 12 of the NPPF (2021).

Neighbouring Amenity

The proposed development is not considered to have any detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, privacy, outlook or sense of enclosure.

The extension is large and would be constructed up to the shared boundary with no.4 Poplar Walk, at two storey level. No. 4 Poplar Walk has no flank windows facing the extension and there are no rear windows proposed on the extension, therefore the extension would not impact on privacy, sense of enclosure or loss of outlook for the neighbour. Moreover, the lack of flank windows and orientation of the properties means that there would be no overshadowing or loss of light impact on the neighbour.

The neighbour to the west (Cossington, Denesway) is set back further from the highway than the application property and the extension hereby proposed would not project beyond the rear elevation of the neighbour, therefore not creating any loss of privacy or overlooking into the garden. Moreover, the neighbour has two high-level obscure glazed windows on the flank elevation facing the application property and therefore the proposed dormer would not overlook nor would the extension impact on outlook or create an unacceptable sense of enclosure. Due to the distance between the properties, there is not considered to be any impact in terms of loss of light.

Overall, there will be no impact on the amenity of adjoining properties in terms of loss of light, overlooking, sense of enclosure or loss of outlook. As such the proposal is considered to safeguard the amenity of adjoining properties in accordance with Policy CS19 (LPCS) and Section 12 of the NPPF (2021).

Parking and Highways

The property benefits from a single car driveway and a detached garage. As part of the development, the existing detached garage would and a new integral garage provided in the extension. The new integral garage would have a length of 4.45m and a width of 2.65m, with a width at the entrance of 2.43m.

Gravesham's Highways Officer provided comment and stated that the garage is undersized contrary to adopted parking standards (SGP 4) (2006) (see extract image below):

Preferred Garage Size for Single Car	5.5m (length) x 3.6m (width)
Preferred Garage Size for Two Cars	5.5m (length) x 6.0m (width)

However, the Highways Officer does state that a practical garage would have a smaller minimum standard to SPG 4 with a minimum width of 2.9m and a length of 5m, therefore the garage proposed falls below the minimum size for a practical garage and cannot be considered a viable parking space.

Therefore, with an undersized non-viable garage the extended property would only provide one off-street parking space. This is contrary to Gravesham's SPG 4 which states that a four bedroom property should provide 2 off-street parking spaces. As such, the Highways Officer has recommended that the application is refused on highway grounds contrary to SPG 4 (2006) and Policy CS11 (Transport) (LPCS).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact on the Landscape - the property is located within the Meopham Downs Landscape Character Area. This area is characterised by gently undulating topography with a mix of arable and pasture farmland, three large settlements located along the A227 and traditional architecture surrounding village greens providing local vernacular.

Policy CS12 (LPCS) seeks to protect the Green infrastructure within the Borough and states at 5.7.26 the overall landscape character and valued landscapes will be conserved, restored and enhanced.

Although the extensions hereby proposed are considered large and poorly designed in relation to the existing dwelling, the development is not considered to have any detrimental impact on the landscape. The property is located within a well-developed part of the rural settlement and will therefore not harm the character of the Meopham Downs landscape.

Conclusion

The application has been fully considered and is in accordance with local and national planning policy.

The two storey rear extension and dormer are disproportionate and bulky additions which fail to respect the scale or character of the property, are not subordinate and dominate and overwhelm the original dwelling. As such the proposal is overdevelopment contrary to Gravesham's Design Guidance SPD (2021), Policy CS19 (Development and Design Principles) of Gravesham's Local Plan Core Strategy of Gravesham's Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Therefore it is recommended that planning permission is refused.

Recommendation

Refusal

(For detailed reasons for refusal and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Mr Ethan Bonthron	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:		Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	3 rd May 2023	Dated:	3rd May 2023