

Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20230550

Location: 25 Dennis Road Gravesend Kent DA11 7NN

Description: Erection of an attached side garage to replace the demolished garage to the rear of the property.

Applicant: Cheryl Wheeler

Site Visit Date: 9 June 2023

Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application form;
- Location Plan;
- Block Plan – Existing;
- Site Plan – Proposed (As Built);
- Existing Floorplan;
- Floor Plan – Proposed;
- Front Elevation – Existing;
- Side Elevation – Existing;
- Rear Elevation – Existing;
- Front Elevation - Proposed;
- Rear Elevation – Proposed; and
- Side Elevation – Proposed.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20050680	Erection of single storey rear extension to form kitchen/diner.	Permission	07.10.2005

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

- CS01 – Sustainable Development
- CS02 – Scale & Distribution of Development
- CS11 - Transport
- 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
- 9 – Promoting sustainable transport
- 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;
- SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006); and
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021).

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

GBC Highways Development Management Officer

I note several other properties in the road already have garages at the side of the property.

Looking at this proposal, the garage would fall well short of current guidance and as such attracts a recommendation of refusal.

The total width of the garage is shown as 2.5 metres and this includes any supporting wall. KCC SPG4 adopted by this Council recommends a minimum internal width of a garage as 3.6 metres, but not this is not always achievable and given the property is old a width of 2.9 metres would be acceptable given the length of the garage which can be used for purposes other than parking a vehicle. The 2.9 metres width is based on a standard (Kent) parking space of 2.5 metres plus 200mm on either side to allow for the doors of the car to be opened and is the space that would commonly be borrowed from an adjacent parking space.

Extracts from SPG4

Preferred garage size

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.

Parking bay size

B8. The preferred sizes for parking bays in Kent provided as part of development proposals are:

	Length	Width
Parking Bay Size for Powered Two-Wheelers ⁽¹⁾	2.5m	1.5m
Parking Bay Size for Cars ⁽²⁾	5.0m	2.5m
Parking Bay Size for People with a Mobility Handicap	5.5m	3.6m
Parking Bay Size for Light Goods Vehicles	7.5m	3.5m
Parking Bay Size for Minibuses ⁽³⁾	8.0m	4.0m
Parking Bay Size for Coaches ⁽³⁾	14.0m	4.0m
Parking Bay Size for Rigid Heavy Goods Vehicles	12.0m	3.5m
Parking Bay Size for Articulated Heavy Goods Vehicles	16.0m	3.5m
Notes:	1. A minimum space of 1.0m should be allowed between each motorcycle. 2. Where car parking spaces are provided parallel to, and abutting, a carriageway, aisle or drive the preferred bay size should be 6.0m x 2.5m to allow vehicles to manoeuvre into the bay when adjoining bays are occupied. The width of end spaces abutting an enclosed boundary should be increased to 2.7m 3. A width of 4.0m is the minimum necessary to allow passengers to embark and disembark safely.	

K.C.C. Draft vehicle parking standards

Table 8 : Minimum Car Parking Space Dimensions

	Length	Width
Cars – Minimum ¹	5.0m (6.0m for parallel spaces ²)	2.5m
Disabled Car Space	5.5m	3.7m
Cars - Abutting hard boundary on one side ³ - Minimum	5.0m	2.7m
Cars - Abutting hard boundary on both sides ³ - Minimum	5.0m	2.9m
Garage - One Car ⁴	7.0m	3.6m
Garage - Two Cars ⁴	7.0m	6.0m
Car Port/Car Barn – One Car ⁵	5.0m	2.5m
Car Port/Car Barn – Two Cars ⁵	5.0m	5.5m
Car Barn – One Car ⁶	5.5m	2.9m
Car Barn – Two Cars ⁶	5.5m	5.4m
Tandem Parking – First Car	6.0m	2.5m

¹ Where space abuts a footway or carriageway, 0.5m setback should be provided

² Applicable where car parking spaces are provided parallel to, and abutting, a carriageway, aisle or drive

³ Typically in a car park, rather than residents driveway

⁴ These dimensions refer to internal dimensions

⁵ These refer to car barns/car ports that are open on all sides

⁶ These refer to car barns that are enclosed

KCC Heritage

The site lies within an area of multi-period archaeological potential. However, I consider it unlikely that these proposals, immediately adjacent to the existing dwelling, would have a significant below-ground archaeological impact and have no further comments to make in this case.

Neighbouring properties

5 surrounding properties were consulted plus site notice – overall consultation expiry date was 30.06.2023 – no responses received.

Officer's Analysis

The principle considerations in the assessment of the application are:

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

Design, Character and Appearance

The application site consists of a two storey semi-detached dwelling situated on the northern side of Dennis Road.

Prior to the garage being built the property had a set of vehicular access gates across the side access set back from the frontage of the dwelling as seen below:



The garage which has been built and as proposed in this application, has been built on the side access of the house. It is 2.5m in width and built up to the flank wall of the garage at the neighbouring property to the east, no. 23 Dennis Road; 12.3m in length extending the whole length of the dwelling and ranges in height from 2.8m in height at the front to 2.4m at the rear due to the flat roof having a slight slope. It has a rolling

electric garage door in the front elevation and a set of double doors in the rear elevation; there are 2 skylights in the top;



The sections in the Council's Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) which are relevant to the proposal are single 'storey side extensions' and 'garages'. In respect of single storey side extensions it states the following on design matters:

- Footprint: Extensions should generally aim to appear subservient to the original building by lying behind the main front building line, though where designed well or having regard to positive local character, other approaches can be supported;
- Height: Extensions that directly abut a neighbouring boundary should be designed to minimise impact on neighbouring amenity;
- Width: Extensions should generally be no greater than half the width of the original building;
- Design: 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. Patterns, design and proportions of windows should reflect the original building and local character. Walls to extensions should not form the site boundary with the public highway, as these can be oppressive and encourage antisocial activities;
- Materials: Matching external materials and window / door frames should be used.

In respect of garages it states the following on design matters:

- Detached garages should reflect the design, materials, character and style of the existing property. Garages should not be located in a position which would detract from the attractiveness of the street scene. Usually garages should be positioned to the side of a dwelling.

In respect of the guidance the attached garage is built in line with the front wall of the host dwelling. It's width is considered modest at 2.5m which is less than half the width of the dwelling (which is 3m). The height of the garage is modest also at 2.8m. The depth of the garage is significant at 12.3m and extending

the entire length of the dwelling but it cannot be seen from the streetscene how deep the garage is so the extension of the garage all the way down the dwelling does not have any impact on the streetscene.

The attached garage is fully visible in the streetscene and does not incorporate a roof design that reflects the main roof of the host dwelling given that the garage has a flat roof and the host dwelling has a pitched roof. The guidance specifically states that the use of flat roofs visible from the streetscene should be avoided. The attached garage has is faced with brick however, the host dwelling is faced with white painted render. There is some brick detailing around the front door and the base of the dwelling but this is a dark brown brick not the lighter brown brick red/brown brick that has been used.

It is noted that there are many other examples of single storey extensions/garages or in some occasions two storey side extensions attached to the side of dwellings in Dennis Road so that in many cases the gap between the dwellings has been lost. The loss of the gap in this case therefore, (the adjacent neighbour to the east has a single storey attached garage also) with a single storey attached garage is considered acceptable in the context of this streetscene and that there would still be a visual gap between the dwellings at first floor level.

It is acknowledged that there are other flat roofed or false pitched roof single storey side extensions at other properties in Dennis Road (and in some cases two storey flat roof extensions) but none of these have been permitted since the adoption of the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021). The neighbouring property to the east, no. 23 Dennis Road has an attached single storey garage which has a false pitched roof (with flat roof behind) but this was permitted in 2015 (ref. 20150998) and therefore although permitted in the current development plan period it was not permitted since the adoption of the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021). As such, it is not considered to justify the flat roof on this garage proposed here given the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) specifically states that the use of flat or false pitched roofs visible from the street should be avoided.

In summary, the garage is considered modest and subservient in respect of its front building line, width and height and its significant depth being considered acceptable due to the full depth of the extension not being visible from the streetscene. However, due to the flat roof design of garage which is not in keeping with the pitched roof design of the host dwelling and the external facing materials not matching the host dwelling, along with the high visibility of the garage in the streetscene, it is considered that the proposed attached garage by virtue of its design and materials is an unsympathetic addition to the host dwelling which is not in keeping with, and therefore harmful to, the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene. The proposal is not in line with the guidance set out in the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) and is contrary to Policy CS19 (LPCS) and section 12 of the NPPF (2021).

Amenity of Occupiers

The rear garden would remain at 157 sq. m and 18.6m in depth and so would exceed the minimum standards for garden area and depth as set out in SPG2 (2020) for a property with 3 bedrooms. In respect of the amenity of occupiers the proposal is therefore considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Neighbouring Amenity

No. 23 Dennis Road is the neighbouring property to the east. This has a single storey attached garage which is even deeper and greater in height than the garage that has been built at no. 25. As such the proposed attached garage would not have any impact on the amenity of the occupiers of no. 25 Dennis Road.

No. 27 Dennis Road is the property to the west, due to the location of the garage on the eastern side of the application garage it would not have any impact on the no. 27.

In respect of neighbouring amenity the proposal would therefore be compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Parking and Highway Safety

SPG4: KCC Parking Standards (2006) state the following internal minimum standards for a garage for a single car:

Preferred Garage Size for Single Car	5.5m (length) x 3.6m (width)
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The Council's Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) also states that this minimum internal dimension is required in order that a garage can properly function as car parking.

The internal measurements of the garage are 12.3m in length and 2.4m in width. It therefore meets the minimum standard for the length of a single garage but not the width which it is just over 1m under the minimum width requirement. As such, the garage cannot properly function as car parking. The Highways Development Management Officer has advised 2.9m internal width would be acceptable but it would still not achieve this. SPG4 (2006) states the maximum parking space requirement for a property with 2 and 3 bedrooms is 2 spaces per dwelling, the property therefore achieves sufficient off-street parking without the garage. However, it remains that the garage does not meet the minimum width for a single garage as set out in SPG4 and reinforced in the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021). As such the proposal is contrary to Policy CS11 (LPCS) and saved Policy P3 (LPFR).

Archaeology

The site lies within an Area of Archaeological Potential and has involved groundworks but KCC Heritage have confirmed there are no issues concerning archaeological impact. As such it is considered the proposal is compliant with saved Policy TC7 (LPFR).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

None.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposal would be acceptable in respect of occupier and neighbouring amenity but would not be acceptable in respect of design, character and appearance or parking. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies CS11 and CS19 (LPCS) and saved Policy P3 (LPFR).

Recommendation: Refusal

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

Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison	Team Leader:	Miss Faye Hobbs
Signed:	<i>Rebecca Harrison</i>	Signed:	
Dated:	18th July 2023	Dated:	19 July 2023