



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20211336

Location: 25 Reynolds Fields Higham Rochester Kent

Description: Demolition of existing single storey garage, erection of a new garage with first floor extension over to form habitable rooms and erection of a single storey rear extension.

Applicant: Mr Charlie Rayfield

Site Visit Date: 22 December 2021

Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application Form;
- Site Location Plan;
- Block/Site Plan;
- Proposed Block/Site Plan;
- Planning Application Drawing, plan no. MAD-432-06.

Relevant Planning History

Application Ref. No.	Description	Decision
20050905	Erection of single storey side extension to form an enlarged garage and shower room/w.c	Approved

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.

Saved Policies in the Gravesham Local Plan First Review (November 1994):

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards

Other material considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

- Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development;
- Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006);
- SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006);
- SPG2 - Residential Layout Guidelines (2020);
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021).

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

Higham Parish Council – No comment

GBC Highways – No objection, although recommended an electric charging point should be installed at the site and additional cycle provision for the additional bedroom.

The Environment Agency – No comment.

Neighbouring properties

17 surrounding properties were consulted and 4 comments of support and 1 objection were received. The consultation period ended on 29/11/2021.

Supporting comments

- Alterations of more in keeping with the immediate locality;
- Will help increase house prices/enhance the area;
- Proposals with enhance existing property;
-

Objections

- Severe impact to loss of light and severe overshadowing caused by height and proximity of proposed building;
- Overlooking from front and rear of our property resulting in the loss of privacy (mainly front main bedroom);
- Severe impact to visual amenity to neighbouring properties (4 Lake Drive);
- Obstruct rural views of Highway and surrounding area.

Officer's Analysis

Site Description

The application site is a two storey semi-detached, 3no. bed, dwelling and a corner plot fronting both Reynolds Fields to the east and Lake Drive to the north. A single storey attached garage adjoins the northern flank wall, subject of the 2005 approved planning permission (20050905).

The surrounding area is residential in character and fairly uniform in architectural style and has a fairly spacious layout characterised by detached garages setback a considerable distance from the rear wall.

Proposal

The proposal seeks permission for the demolition of the existing garage and the erection of a two storey side extension that extends partly beyond the rear wall of the host property but mostly maintains the footprint of the existing garage. A single storey extension is also proposed to the rear wall of the host dwelling which extends 1.5metres. The proposal would provide a new garage space/utility space and extension to the kitchen at ground floor. At first floor the development would accommodate more habitable space and an additional bedroom i.e. increase to 4no. bed property.

Design, Character and Appearance

With regards to the two storey side extension proposed, by virtue of the existing single storey garage to the northern flank wall, the proposal seeks to use the footprint of the existing garage to accommodate the development which is approximately 5m from the northern flank wall which is slightly set off the boundary shared with the public highway. However, the plans indicate that the proposed side extension would extend 5.35m from the northern flank wall and, thus, increase the width of the addition to the flank wall slightly. This increase in width has not been made explicit in the application, but the measurements are displayed on the plans.

The width of the existing dwelling would be 5.27m and would appear and the two storey element of the proposal would practically replicate the footprint for another dwelling to the northern flank wall. Evidently, the proposal fails to represent a subservient addition to the host property and the addition of the first floor element of the proposal, along with the increased width of the side addition, would add significant bulk and massing to the flank elevation. The footprint of the existing garage is a material consideration, but as the garage is a single storey addition and, to a degree, preserves the open/spacious character of the immediate locality. However, the first floor element contributes significant massing at first floor level and the roof form proposed appears slightly awkward.

The Householder Design Guide SPD (2021), paragraph 10.5, maintains that the width of two storey extensions should be subservient to the host building and setback from the front wall of the host building. The Householder SPD (2021) seeks to encourage side extensions that contribute to the positive local character. Therefore, given the scale of proposal, it would appear as an overdominant addition to the northern flank wall and, furthermore, as the two storey dwelling would project beyond the rear wall of the host property, the development would also create a large façade to the north fronting the properties opposite at 5-9 Lake Drive with only 4 small windows. The fenestration to the rear of the two storey rear projection are not adequately aligned which is a design concern given how exposed the site is. In light of the above and as the resultant flank wall would be fairly uncharacteristic and overbearing, the proposal fails to comply with paragraphs 10.5/10.6 of the Householder Design SPD (2021).

There is also a single storey rear extension proposed which projects beyond the rear wall of the main dwelling by approximately 1.5m which effectively extends the kitchen area. The overall design and roofslope would appear appropriate to the host dwelling.

Therefore, the application is contrary to CS19 of the adopted Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), paragraphs 126 and 130 of the NPPF (2021) and fails to comply with paragraphs 10.5 and 10.6 of the Householder Design SPD (2021).

Amenity of Future Occupiers

The proposed block plan supplied seems to indicate that the two storey element of the application would be in a similar position to the existing garage, however, the plans indicate that the existing garage measures 10.2m in depth while the proposed two storey element would project 10.6m in depth. With the ground floor extension the overall private amenity space retained at the site would result in approximately 79sq.m and at the most would have a 8m depth.

The Residential Layout Guidelines SPD2 (June 2020) maintains that for a dwelling of 4 bedrooms or more should have a minimum private amenity space of 100sq.m and a minimum of 10m garden depth. Clearly, for a large dwelling with 4 bedrooms, the private amenity space retained at the site would be insufficient for the number of units proposed. The current 3no. bed dwelling has sufficient private amenity space for the current number of bedrooms for the host property.

Therefore, in respect of the standard of garden space retained for future occupants, the additional bedroom proposed bedroom means that the application site would not have sufficient garden space.

Therefore, the proposal would be detrimental for future occupants of the dwelling conflicting with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF 2021.

Neighbouring Amenity

Most comments received were in support of the application, however, notwithstanding this, the side addition proposed, being two storey and projecting beyond the rear wall of host dwelling potentially increases the overlooking to the opposite property to the rear at 4 Lake Drive. The site has a garage with a first floor addition above.

Concerns were raised in relation to overlooking and loss of daylight/sunlight resulting from the development. However, the position of the two storey part of the proposal would mainly overlook the front of the site at 4 Lake Drive and not considered to create a detriment impact in terms of overlooking. In terms of loss of light, given the orientation of the sun, again, it is not considered there would be a detrimental loss of light to the surrounding properties. In terms of loss of a view, of the surrounding area, this is not considered a material consideration.

With regards to the ground floor extension, this would only project 1.5metres from the rear. The plans do not clearly indicate the impact to the ground floor windows to the rear of no. 23 Reynolds Fields. Despite this, given the 1.5m depth of the rear extension it is not considered this would have an overbearing impact from

Highways and Parking

The Highways Officer has been consulted in relation of the site and raised no objection to the application subject to electric charging points installed and cycle provisions for the additional bedroom create. However, as the application is being recommended for refusal, this is not considered relevant at present.

Conclusion

The scale of the side addition to the northern flank wall, being two storey, on a highly exposed corner plot is considered unacceptable, in design terms. The development also would result in an addition bedroom and the site does not accommodate sufficient private amenity space for a four bedroom property.

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

Case Officer:	Ms Genna Henry	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:	<i>G. Henry</i>	Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	22nd December 2021	Dated:	22nd December 2021