

Monday, 16 December 2024

Objection to Application 20241081

Site Address: 42 Cricketers Drive, Meopham, Gravesend, Kent, DA13 0AX

Description: Demolition of existing rear garage and conservatory. Erection of single storey side and rear wrap around extension, hip to gable enlargement to allow for the creation of a rear dormer, installation of roof lights in the front roof slope and conversion of roof into habitable rooms.

[Introduction:](#)

This objection letter relates to application 20241081, which is a householder planning application for the demolition of the existing rear garage and conservatory and the erection of a single storey side and rear wrap around extension, a hip to gable enlargement to allow for the creation of a rear dormer, the installation of roof lights in the front roof slope and the conversion of the roof into habitable space at 42 Cricketers Drive, Meopham, Gravesend, Kent, DA13 0AX.

[Relevant Planning Policy:](#)

National Planning Policy:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

National Design Guide (NDG)

Local Planning Policy:

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy and Local Plan Policies Map (2014)

Gravesham Local Plan First Review (1994) – saved Policies

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Residential Layout Guidelines SPG2

Design for Gravesham - Design Code SPD

Householder Extensions / Alterations Design Guide SPD

[Discussion of Scheme:](#)

Design, Visual Amenity and Heritage:

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that all developments will add to the overall quality of the area over the lifetime of the development, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, establish and maintain a strong sense of place using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit,

optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF goes on to state that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that achieving good design “is about creating places, buildings, or places that work well for everyone, look good, and will adapt to the needs of future generations.”

Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 sets out that new development will be visually attractive, fit for purpose and locally distinctive. It should conserve and enhance the character of the built environment and take account of the scale, height, building lines and other architectural features of buildings. Account should also be taken of strategic views, site topography, the significance of heritage assets and features of townscape and landscape value which contribute to local character and sense of place.

The Gravesham Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) outlines that any proposed extensions and alterations to a house should respect the original character of the existing dwelling, complement, and correspond with the character of neighbouring properties and the local area.

In relation to single-storey rear extensions, the Gravesham Householder Design Guide outlines that an extension must not dominate the original property. This can cause the site to appear overdeveloped. Furthermore, the Design Guide outlines that extensions should not be of greater width than the original building.

The proposal seeks to provide a significant wraparound extension to the property; it would be significant in depth and width, extending across the entire width of the plot, past the property's side elevation and 6.3m past the rear elevation; the additional footprint would be larger than that of the existing dwelling, representing an overly large addition which would fail to appear suitably subservient; it is clear that the extension has been designed for maximum internal space, rather than taking a design-led approach.

Furthermore, the Gravesham Design Guide states that side extensions are of greater visibility and should incorporate roof designs to reflect the main property's roof. The use of flat or false pitched roofs visible from the street should be avoided. It also states that side extensions should aim to appear subservient to the original building by lying behind the main front building line.

The proposed extension would have a false pitched roof to the front, in an attempt to hide the significant amounts of contrived flat-roofing provided above the proposed extension. The proposed side extension would extend up to the principal elevation of the dwelling, and would not be set back, failing to appear subservient to the existing building.

As such, it is considered that the wraparound extension, due to its bulk, mass, footprint and design would fail to accord to the policies outlined within Policy CS19, and would sit in direct and clear opposition to the design guidelines contained within the Gravesham Design Guide; it would not conserve and enhance the character of the built environment, and would result in harm to the visual amenity of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, the application should be refused.

It goes on to state that dormers should not overwhelm the roof slope within which they are to be placed, being sited well clear of the roof edges and eaves. It also states that full width, flat dormers are both out of character in terms of scale and design.

The proposed dormer is significant in scale, subsuming the entire width and depth of the roof slope, with a flat roof above. In this instance, it is considered that the additional volume to the roof, through both the provision of a hip-to-gable extension and a rear dormer would result in harm to the character of the existing dwelling; the significantly sized, flat-roofed dormer which would take up a majority of the rear roof slope would appear as an extra storey to the dwelling which would fail to properly respect the character of the host, and would result in harm to the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

All of these elements added together would create a development which is much worse than the sum of its parts, each one exacerbating the failings of others in terms of bulk, massing, and design. The result would be significant visual harm to the host dwelling, and the surrounding area, in contravention of the policies contained within the development plan and NPPF. As such, the application should be refused.

Residential Amenity:

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF sets out six criteria against which planning decisions should meet to deliver well-designed places. This includes criteria (f), which requires development to “create places ... with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.”

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that achieving good design “is about creating places, buildings, or places that work well for everyone, look good, and will adapt to the needs of future generations.”

Policy CS19 states that new development will be located, designed, and constructed to safeguard the amenity, including daylight and sunlight of neighbouring properties.

The Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) states that extensions that directly abut a neighbouring boundary should be designed to minimise impact on neighbouring amenity.

The extension would be significant in terms of footprint, bulk and massing extending up to both side boundaries of the site. It would extend 6.3m past the rear elevation of the dwelling, directly next to the garden and patio areas of neighbouring dwellings, in close proximity to the rear windows of ground-floor habitable rooms.

It would extend significantly above the fence line, resulting in the total enclosure of these rear garden boundaries with tall, blank, built form. This enclosure of the garden boundaries of these properties would result in significant overbearing impacts and feelings of enclosure, as well as unacceptable loss of light and overshadowing of the rear garden areas to the detriment of the residential amenity of these properties. This includes direct impacts on the patio and sitting areas of these dwellings, which sit directly behind. Patio areas directly behind dwellings are the most well-used, tranquil areas of amenity, and impacts on these are felt most acutely.

Furthermore, the proximity of the proposed building to the rear windows of these properties would result in a significant and unacceptable loss of light and outlook, causing further harm to the residential amenity of the occupiers of these dwellings. Both the Residential Design Guide and BRE guidelines (Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice' (BR209 2022)) outline both a horizontal and vertical component for measuring loss of light; in this instance, the tall, deep extension would sit well within 45 degrees of rear facing glazing features which serve habitable rooms, and as such, the proposed would result in a material loss of outlook, loss of light and overbearing impacts on the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers, through overbearingness and enclosure, loss of outlook, overshadowing and loss of light, and overlooking. The application fails to comply with Policy CS19, the requirements of the Householder Design Guide, and the relevant provisions of the NPPF, and the application should be refused.

Conclusion:

It is considered that the proposal would result in visual harm to the host dwelling and surrounding area. Furthermore, the proposal would result in significant and unacceptable impacts on the residential amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring occupiers. As such, the application should be refused.