

# Delegated Report

## Householder Planning Application

**Planning Application No:** 20221167

**Location:** 23 Codrington Gardens Gravesend Kent DA12 5DB

**Description:** Demolition of existing extension and erection of a rear extension.

**Applicant:** Ms Michelle Webb

**Site Visit Date:** N/A/Desktop Assessment

### Submitted Documents/Plans

Application Form

DKM/5170/01 Rev 0 – Location Plan

DKM/S170/02 Rev 01 – Existing Block Plan

DKM/S170/02 Rev 01 – Proposed Block Plan

DKM.S170/04 Rev 01 – Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

### Relevant Planning History

| Reference | Description                                                                                                                          | Decision  | Decision Date |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| 19820498  | Erection of a porch at the front single storey extension to form conservatory at rear and erection of detached garage in rear garden | Permitted | 02.09.1982    |

### 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);
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021)

### **Consultations, Publicity and Representations**

The final date to make comments on this application ended on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2022.

#### Consultees

Ward Councillors: No Comments received.

#### Neighbouring properties

4 surrounding properties were consulted, and no comments were received.

### **Officer's Analysis**

#### Summary Information

|                  | <b>Existing Single Storey Rear Projection (m)</b> | <b>Proposed Rear Extension (m)</b> | <b>Change (+/-m)</b> |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Max height       | 2.8 (Parapet)                                     | 2.9 (Parapet)                      | +0.1                 |
| Max eaves height | 2.6                                               | 2.7                                | +0.1                 |
| Max Width        | 7.6                                               | 7.7                                | +0.1                 |
| Max Depth        | 2.2                                               | 4.1                                | +1.9                 |

#### Principle of Development

This application is located inside the Urban Boundary, where alterations and extensions to residential buildings are generally acceptable in principle as per Policy CS02: Scale and Distribution of Development. However, all other relevant matters should be considered. In this instance, the main points to consider would be the potential impact on; Visual Amenity (Design, Character and Appearance), Amenity of Future Occupiers and Residential Amenity of neighbours.

#### Design, Character and Appearance

The existing dwellinghouse is a two-storey, brick built, mid-terraced structure. Its principal elevation is not directly served by a highway immediately to the front and so a garage is located in the rear garden accessible from Codrington Gardens to the rear. This is a highly urbanised area with similar roof pitches, layout and design. However, it is evident that changes have occurred overtime, particularly with extensions and outbuildings in the rear gardens. Given the existing variance in design and given that the addition would not be immediately visible from the public perspective due to its location and boundary treatment enclosing the rear garden, the impact of an extension where appropriate in scale and design, would not be uncharacteristic in this residential area.

The main change resulting from the proposed extension in terms of scale would be an increase of 1.9

metres in depth from the projection it would replace. The resultant 4.1 metres deep extension would be greater than half the depth of the existing main part of the dwellinghouse of 6.3m depth. There is potential for a large bulky addition of such depth to disbalance the main dwellinghouse and appear disproportional. However, whilst an extension of lesser depth would be preferable, to reduce this it is considered that the single storey, flat roof addition of 1.9 metre greater depth would on balance not be significantly disproportional and on balance would be subservient in scale.

Flat roofs are often not appropriate on residential properties as they can appear harsh and unsympathetic. However, to the rear, where there is less visibility it can reduce bulk with minimal impact to the character of the area. An additional point to note is that there is an existing flat roof on this projection and this design would reflect that. The application form highlights that the proposed extension would use facing brickwork to match the existing dwellinghouse, with white upvc windows and a GRP flat roof. This would be reflective of the residential nature of the property.

On balance, the proposed development would comply with the requirements of Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021) in terms of design, character and appearance.

#### Amenity of Future Occupiers

The proposed extension would allow for an open plan kitchen/dining area, providing room for a utility, wc and extended hallway where the kitchen is currently situated. The first-floor layout would be unchanged.

The rooms meet the required minimum space standards and would continue to have adequate rear garden depth and area as per SPG2 - Residential layout guidelines including Housing Standards Policy Statement October 2015 Adopted 1996 – amended June 2020.

#### Neighbouring Amenity

There are 2 neighbours most likely to be implicated by the proposed extension; 21 Codrington Gardens and 25 Codrington Gardens.

##### *21 Codrington Gardens*

This neighbour is located to the north and is attached. It has previously been extended and altered, resulting in a rear dormer extension and a single storey rear extension. The rear projection matches that of the existing, subject dwellinghouse and to the proposed single storey extension would be 1.9m greater than this neighbour's projection. Given the maximum 2.9 metre height, the existing boundary treatment and lack of side facing openings, the proposed extension would not overbear in terms of scale, potential overshadowing or direct overlook.

##### *25 Codrington Gardens*

This neighbour is located to the south and is attached. It does not have a rear projection and so the proposed extension would be 4.1 metres deeper than this neighbour's rearmost extension. Given its low height and the existing boundary fencing it is considered that this would not result in significant overbearing bulk or overshadowing. There would be no new windows directly facing this neighbour. However, to ensure that openings so close to the boundary are not created without consideration, a condition would be included where approved removing permitted development rights for windows in this position.

The proposal is therefore considered to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring properties in compliance with policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014.

#### **Conclusion & Recommendation**

The proposed development complies with all relevant national and local planning policies. The recommendation is to approve.

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

|                      |                                                                                   |                     |                                                                                    |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Case Officer:</b> | Ms Lisa Williams                                                                  | <b>Team Leader:</b> | Richard Hart                                                                       |
| <b>Signed:</b>       |  | <b>Signed:</b>      |  |
| <b>Dated:</b>        | 19th December 2022                                                                | <b>Dated:</b>       | 19 <sup>th</sup> December 2022                                                     |

Gravesham Borough Council