

Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20221176

Location: 60 Cheyne Walk Meopham Gravesend Kent

Description: Single storey rear extension, alterations to front porch and windows, new private drive & vehicle crossover

Applicant: Ms Angela Lemon

Site Visit Date: 15th December 2022

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application Form

22-31-01 – Location Plan

22-31-02 – Site Plans Existing and Proposed

22-31-03 – Existing Floor Plans and Elevations

22-31-04 – Proposed Plans

22-31-05 – Proposed Elevations

Relevant Planning History

No Relevant Planning History

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

- CS01 – Sustainable Development
- CS02 – Scale & Distribution of Development
- CS11 – Transport
- CS12 – Green Infrastructure
- CS18 – Climate Change
- CS19 - Development & Design Principles

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards
- T1 – Impact of Development on the Highway Network

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); and
- Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment (2009)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

The period for submission of comments on this application ended on 28.11.22. The parish council requested and were granted an extension until 06.12.22.

Consultees

Ward Councillors:

No comments received

Parish Council:

'Meopham Parish Council has no objections to this planning application providing it meets the requirements of GBC's Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide.'

Southern Water:

It appears that the developer is intending to build over to a public foul sewer which is crossing the site. Building over a "public sewer" is not normally permitted by Southern Water. An investigation of the sewer is required to confirm its size and depth, ascertain its condition, number of properties served and potential means of access before any decision can be made as to whether it would be acceptable for Southern Water to allow building over to the sewer.

The length of sewer to be built over under the terms of Part H of the Building Regulations dictates that the matter is determined by the sewerage undertaker, which in this case is Southern Water. The conditions and application associated with the build-over/close-to a public sewer are available at Southern Water's Get Connected service: developerservices.southernwater.co.uk.

Please note: There is a water communication pipe within the development site.

Furthermore, it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

In order to protect drainage apparatus, Southern Water requests that if consent is granted, the following condition is attached to the planning permission; prior to the commencement of development, the developer must advise the local authority, in consultation with Southern Water, of measures which will be undertaken to protect the public sewers.

Southern Water requires a formal application for any new connection to the public foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

To make an application visit Southern Water's Get Connected service: developerservices.southernwater.co.uk and please read our New Connections Charging

Arrangements documents which are available on our website via the following link:
southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangements

Our initial investigations indicate that there are no public surface water sewers in the area to serve this development. Alternative means of draining surface water from this development are required. This should not involve disposal to a public foul sewer and should be in line with the Hierarchy of H3 of Building Regulations with preference for use of soakaways.
gov.uk/government/publications/drainage-and-waste-disposal-approved-document-h

KCC Highways:

Referring to the above description, it would appear that this development proposal does not meet the criteria to warrant involvement from the Highway Authority in accordance with the current consultation protocol arrangements.

GBC Highways:

The applicant should be required not to have any soft or hard landscaping or boundary treatment over 850mm height within 2 metres of the back edge of the footway to protect pedestrian visibility splays in the interests of road safety.

The permeable paving should be maintained in accordance with the requirements of the manufacturer.

Dickens Protection Society:

The Society notes there is a parking area and garages at the south end of the block. In the Society's view the proposed drive and subsequent parking in front of the property would have some impact on the amenity of the area.

Neighbouring properties

5 surrounding properties were consulted, and one comment was received. This comment objected to the application for the following reasons:

- Reduce on-road parking provision
- Danger from other vehicles pushed to park on bend in the road.
- Removal of hedges which have been present for a long period of time.

Officer's Analysis

Summary Information

	Existing Rear Projection (m)	Proposed Single Storey Extension (m)	Change (+/-m)
Max height	2.8	2.8	No change
Max Width	2.9	5.6	+2.7
Max Depth	2.1	2.1	No Change

Principle of Development

This application is located inside a rural settlement inset from the Green Belt, 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, Residential Amenity of neighbours, Parking Provision and Trees.

Design, Character and Appearance

This dwellinghouse forms part of a row of terraced, two storey dwellinghouses. It is located at a slight bend in the road and to its front elevation is set forward of the dwellinghouses to the south and matching the adjoining dwellinghouse to the north. It has a brick ground floor elevation and wall hung tiles to the first floor. The front garden has an open frontage with a small hedge at the boundary. There is a large tree to the front and north along the highway.

There is an existing single storey rear projection, which would be enlarged as a result of the extension. The extension would result in a full width extension at 2.1m deep. At single storey this would not be dissimilar to other rear facing extensions in the vicinity. In particular the immediate adjoining properties to the north and south both have additions of similar depth and width. Ultimately, the scale and design of this addition would not be disproportionate to the main dwellinghouse and would be reflective of the urban residential character of the area.

The porch would also be altered internally, and the openings altered. There would be no change to the scale of the porch. The altered openings proposed would be appropriate in scale and number and would be appropriate in this setting.

The proposed external materials would be brick and tile hanging to match the existing, single ply upvc membrane or fibreglass roof, upvc windows, as noted on the application form. This would be appropriate for a residential extension, in this area.

In terms of the driveway proposed, it is noted that this dwellinghouse has a character with an existing open frontage, albeit with a small hedge to the front which would need to be removed to accommodate the vehicular access. Given the minor scale nature and lack of similar hedges in the vicinity, it is not considered to be of significant contribution to the character of the area, in a matter which would require retention. There are other properties nearby with front drives and so it would not be out of character to create a front drive. The plan shows that the kerb will use concrete and tarmac in line with KCC specification and the proposed drive would use permeable tarmac. To ensure that a permeable material is used, a condition will be included to ensure that an appropriate permeable material would be used.

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 open plan kitchen/dining room meets 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 no. adjoining properties to the sides potentially impacted by the development; 63 Cheyne Walk and 58 Cheyne Walk.

62 Cheyne Walk

This neighbour is located to the north and is attached. Whilst not shown on the block plans or floor plans, aerial maps and seen during the site visit was a single storey projection on this neighbour's rear elevation of approximate 2.5m depth. This neighbour's extension would therefore be 0.4m deeper than the proposed extension. There is close boarded fencing at the shared boundary. There would be no new upper floor openings directly facing this neighbour. On balance, the proposed extension would not overbear on this neighbour in terms of physical and overbearing bulk, overshadowing or direct overlook.

58 Cheyne Walk

This neighbour is located to the south and is attached. It has a rear single storey extension approximately 2.3m in depth. However, given that this dwellinghouse is stepped back its rear projection

extends by approximately 4 metres beyond the rear of the main dwellinghouse. This neighbour's extension would therefore be 1.9 metres deeper than the proposed extension. There is close boarded fencing at the shared boundary. There would be no new upper floor openings directly facing this neighbour. On balance, the proposed extension would not overbear on this neighbour in terms of physical and overbearing bulk, overshadowing or direct overlook.

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

Parking Provision

The existing number of bedrooms are 3 and this would not change. This has been confirmed by email by the planning agent. The proposed alterations and extensions would not result in an increased number of bedrooms. There are currently no off-road parking spaces associated with this dwellinghouse. SPG 4 – KCC Parking Standards (2006), requires that single bays have dimensions of 4.8m (Length) x 2.4m (width). The proposed drive from back of pavement is 6m (Length) x 2.75m (Width) and meets the required standards.

Given that the existing number of bedrooms would not change. The existing parking provision requirement as per the SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006); of 2 would remain unchanged. However, it is noted that there is no current onsite parking providing and it is unlikely that this particular property has the space to ever provide 2 car parking spaces. The addition of 1 space would therefore be a positive. A condition would be included to ensure a permeable material is used; it is considered that. It should be noted however that to use the surface as a drive and to drop the kerb, consent from KCC Highways would likely be required and an informative will be included on the decision to this effect.

To address neighbour concerns regarding loss of on-road parking provision. Should a dropped kerb approved by KCC be put in place and the front garden space be used to park one vehicle, whilst an on-road parking space would be lost and off-road parking space would be created, thus having a neutral impact. Another comment raised concerns regarding the potential increase for dangerous parking on the bend. However, it is noted that rule 243 of the Highway Code requires that vehicles do not stop on a bend in the road. Whilst not a legal requirement, it is generally expected that drivers should park their vehicles safely. It is not considered likely that the introduction of one drive will result in significant increased parking of vehicles in an unsafe manner.

Adequate parking provision is not available currently. The proposed drive would not provide the 2 spaces required by the KCC Parking Standards and it would not be in compliance with policies T1 and P3 of the Local Plan First Review 1994 and Policies CS11 and CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014. However, given that an additional parking space where there is none would be an improvement, it would be unreasonable to refuse an application which would not cause detrimental harm to the existing on-site level of parking provision, but would improve it.

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

Trees:

Neighbour comments have been received with regard to concern regarding impact to the tree near the front of this property. This property is NOT in a Conservation Area, nor is this tree a protected tree. Therefore, lesser weight is applied to the desire to retain the tree than would be in those circumstances. However, it is noted that trees and soft landscaping in the area do have a positive contribution to the character of the area and where possible, it is desirable to retain this tree. The tree is not in direct frontage of the property so it would not be required to fell the tree. However, trees often have a shallow widespread rooting area as opposed to the common assumption that roots grow downward further into the soil. For protected trees for instance the root protection area is calculated at 12 times the circumference of the tree. It can therefore be assumed that a non-protected tree would have a similar rooting area and excavation and hard surfacing or compression should be avoided within this space. A further indication of the location of tree roots can be ascertained from the cracks in hard surfacing nearby. There are evident cracks in the hard surfacing of the

driveway from 62 Cheyne Walk and further to the north on the pathway. To the south of this tree, the hard surface cracking on the pavement extend to the front of the subject dwellinghouses. So, it is likely that the rooting area for this tree fronts this dwellinghouse. The impact of this is that compression and hard surfacing may impact the health of the tree and the rooting area itself could result in future cracking of the drive. However, given the lack of a Tree Protection Order or location in a Conservation Area, limited weight can be applied to the potential loss of the tree and so this would not present a reason for refusal of this application alone. However, the applicant is advised that there are potential methods of creating a drive which could mitigate the likelihood of harm to this tree. The applicant is advised that they may want to consider use of a no-dig compact resistant cellular system with geotextile fabric. The guidance note produced by the Arboricultural Association on such systems can be found here:

<https://www.trees.org.uk/News-Blog/Latest-News/New-guide-to-use-of-cellular-confinement-systems-n>

Public Foul Sewer

Southern Water have commented on this proposal advising that it would involving building above a public foul sewer and that they would not normally find this acceptable. These comments are noted. However, the impact of building over a public foul sewer is one of little materiality in this instance and rather is a consideration for Southern Water. Therefore, whilst the application would not be refused merely on these grounds, informatives would be included as requested, advising the applicant of the required consultation with Southern Water as part of the works. This would allow for Southern Waters concerns to be addressed separately from this planning application as is appropriate.

Conclusion & Recommendation

With the exception of parking, the proposed development complies with all relevant national and local planning policies. Considering the parking, the proposed development whilst not meeting the required level of parking for a house of this size, would result in an improvement to the existing level of parking provision. The recommendation is to approve.

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

Case Officer:	Ms Lisa Williams	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:		Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	15 December 2022	Dated:	16th December 2022