



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20240081

Location: 1 Chalky Bank Gravesend Kent DA11 7NZ

Description: Alteration to the existing roof with an increase in the ridge height and erection of dormer extension in the rear roof slope, installation of 2no. roof lights in the front roof slope and conversion of the roof space into gym and prayer room.

Applicant: Mr Asif

Site Visit Date: 22.03.2024

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application form;
Covering Letter;
Drawing no. 001 Rev. A – Block Plan, Location Plan;
Drawing no. 003 Rev. A – Existing Elevations;
Drawing no. 004 Rev. B – Proposed Floor Plans; and
Drawing no. 005 Rev. A – Proposed Elevations.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20230800	Roof alterations to incorporate an increase in ridge height, hip to gable roof, erection of 3 dormers in the rear roof slope, installation of rooflights within the front roof slope and conversion of the roof space to form additional rooms.	Refused	12.09.2023
20080167	Retention of the canopy across the front of dwelling.	Permitted	17.04.2008
20071078	Erection of a detached garage.	Permitted	04.02.2008
20071079	Erection of single storey rear extension to form a lounge and shower room/wc.	Permitted	24.01.2008
20070853	Erection of a front porch in substitution of that previously granted planning permission under reference number GR/2006/970 and construction of a pitched roof over the existing flat roof canopy on the front elevation.	Permitted	14.11.2007
20060970	Erection of two storey side extension to form enlarged lounge at ground floor level with one bedroom and ensuite shower room/wc at first floor level and erection of a front porch.	Permitted	12.01.2007

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

- CS01 – Sustainable Development
- CS02 – Scale & Distribution of Development
- CS12 – Green Infrastructure
- CS19 – Development & Design Principles

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards

Paragraph 33 of the NPPF (2023) 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 (2023), the Council will also seek to replace these.

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

- Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- Section 12 – Achieving well-designed and beautiful 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

Consultees

GBC Highways Officer

I have no highway objections. The property already has four bedrooms and so the potential of any more does not require additional car parking. The existing car parking provision is not affected by this development.

However, as the two additional rooms (prayer room and gym) could be used as bedrooms by the applicant or a future occupier 2 secure cycle parking places should be provided to conform to adopted vehicle parking standards (KCC SPG4).

Neighbouring properties

9 surrounding properties were consulted with an overall consultation expiry date of 12.04.2024 – one response received (objection) which can be summarised as follows:

- Will cause a considerable amount of disruption, noise and make it difficult for them to access their property – **Officer Note: Construction noise/disturbance during a development is not a material planning consideration and would be dealt with under noise legislation. Rights of access would also be a non-material planning consideration and would be a civil matter;**

- The property already causes road disruption having the drive configured the way it is, so to add to this with building work means further problems and traffic on the street, where parking is already an issue – **Officer Note: As above vehicles relating to the construction period would not be a material planning consideration. Parking and highway safety is discussed below.**

Officer's Analysis

The application site consists of a two storey detached dwelling situated on the eastern side of Chalky Bank.

This is a re-submission of previous application ref. 20230800 which was for 'Roof alterations to incorporate an increase in ridge height, hip to gable roof, erection of 3 dormers in the rear roof slope, installation of rooflights within the front roof slope and conversion of the roof space to form additional rooms' which was refused on 12 September 2023 on the following grounds:

1. The development would result in a highly incongruous dwelling that lacks character and would result in overdevelopment of the property. In addition, the proposal is unsympathetic to the original dwelling and would be contrary to the character and appearance of the area. As such the development would be contrary to Policy CS19 of Gravesham's Local Plan Core Strategy (LPCS) (2014) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023).

2. The proposal would result in an inadequate private garden area and would therefore fail to safeguard the amenity of future occupiers, contrary to Policy CS19 of Gravesham's Local Plan Core Strategy (LPCS) (2014) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023).

This current proposal is for 'Alteration to the existing roof with an increase in the ridge height and erection of dormer extension in the rear roof slope, installation of 2no. roof lights in the front roof slope and conversion of the roof space into gym and prayer room.'

It therefore needs to be seen whether this re-submitted proposal addresses the grounds of refusal of previous application ref. 20230800 and whether all other matters are acceptable.

The principal consideration in the assessment of this application are:

Design, Character and Appearance

This matter related to ground of refusal no. 1 of application ref. 20230800.

For ease of reference the existing, refused and proposed elevations are as follows:

Existing Dwelling:



Refused Application ref. 20230800:



Current proposal ref. 20240081:



The issues with the previous application in respect of design, character and appearance were

- The property has already been extended with a number of additions and the proposal would exacerbate this adding significant bulk and massing to an already large dwelling;

- The proposed changes to the roof would have given the impression of a row of terraced houses, rather than a family dwellinghouse;
- The development would result in a highly incongruous dwelling that lacks character, result in an overdevelopment of the property and would overwhelm the site;
- Unsympathetic to the original dwelling and be contrary to the character and appearance of the area;

In this case the proposed hip to gable extension is no longer proposed, this therefore reduces some of the bulk that was previously proposed and removes the issue of the dwelling appearing like a row of terraced dwellings.

The increase in ridge height is still proposed. Due to the slope of the road and the ground levels the height of the existing dwelling ranges from 7.29m at its point furthest up Chalky Bank and 7.87m at its point lowest down. In the refused scheme the dwelling would have been 8.4m in height however, those plans did not show the slope of the land and there would have been a variation in height due to this. In the proposed scheme the dwelling would range from 7.62m at its point furthest up Chalky Bank to 8.3m at its point lowest down. The increase in the height of the ridgeline on the existing would therefore range from 0.33m – 0.43m. This is considered a minimal amount and the resultant height of the dwelling would not appear out of keeping with the heights of the other dwellings to the south of the application dwelling.

Instead of three individual dormers in the rear roof slope which were proposed previously there would now be one dormer. This would be 9.1m in width, 2m in height and 2.4m in depth; it would have three windows. The Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) states that rear roof extensions should be set away from the hips, eaves and ridge of a property; the height should be lower than the ridgeline; dormers should not overwhelm the roof slope and window position and design should reflect the position, design and character of windows to the lower levels of the host building. In this case the dormer extension would be set away from the hips, up from the eaves and down from the ridge. There would still be a good amount of roof slope visible around the dormer such that it would not overwhelm the roof slope. The gym and bathroom window would align through with the windows underneath although they would be of a smaller size however, it is considered that small windows in the dormer would be more appropriate than the larger windows lower down. The prayer room window would not really align with anything below but this is because there is a very small window below at first floor level which is off-set and there are no windows below that at ground floor level. However, the prayer room window is considered to be acceptable as it would match the gym window proposed in the dormer. The dormer would have a hipped roof design rather than a standard flat roof design found on many dormers. Although this would add to the height of the dormer the hipped roof design would replicate the hipped roof design of the host dwelling and is as discussed considered to be in keeping with the scale of the roof slope.

There are two rooflights proposed which are modest in size and set in from the hips, down from the ridge and up from the eaves.

In summary, the increase in height of the ridgeline is considered minimal and would not make the dwelling appear overly large or out of keeping in the streetscene. The dormer is considered modest in size and in keeping with the scale and character of the host dwelling. The two proposed rooflights are modest and centrally located within the roof slope. From the front of the dwelling it would essentially appear the same as existing apart from a slight increase in the ridge height and two rooflights. The dormer would be at the rear but in any case is considered subservient to the rear roof slope and well designed.

Overall therefore, in respect of design, character and appearance the proposal is considered an improvement on the previous proposal. It is now acceptable in respect of design, character and appearance and compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS); as such ground of refusal no. 1 of previous application ref. 20230800 has been resolved.

Amenity of Occupiers

This matter related to ground of refusal no. 2 of application ref. 20230800. The issue being that the

proposal would have added two extra bedrooms to the property but the private area was undersized. In this case the proposed roof conversion would be for a gym, bathroom and a prayer room and so would not add any additional bedrooms to the property. As no additional bedrooms are proposed and there is no alteration to the existing garden there is no requirement to measure the garden area and rear garden depth as this will remain as the existing situation and the amenity of occupiers will not be affected. In respect of occupier amenity the proposal is therefore now considered acceptable and compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS); as such ground of refusal no. 2 of previous application ref. 20230800 has been resolved.

Neighbouring Amenity

As with application ref. 20230800 it is considered that due to the siting of the proposals and distance from neighbouring properties the proposal would cause no overshadowing, loss of light or outlook or overlooking to any neighbouring properties. The minimal increase in height of the ridgeline and the distance of the neighbouring property to the south means there would be no impact on that property, There are no dwellings to the rear (east) and so no issues of overlooking with the dormer and the rooflights due to their outlook would cause no overlooking to the properties to the front. In respect of neighbouring amenity it is therefore considered the proposal would be compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Parking and Highway Safety

The proposal would not add any additional bedrooms nor alter existing parking. As such no issues regarding parking or highway safety and in this respect the proposal is compliant with saved Policy P3 (LPFR).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

None.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposal is now considered acceptable in respect of design, character and appearance and occupier amenity and has therefore resolved grounds of refusal nos. 1 & 2 of previous application ref. 20230800. The proposal remains acceptable in respect of neighbouring amenity and parking and highway safety.

Recommendation: Permission

(For detailed conditions and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison	Team Leader:	Miss Faye Hobbs
Signed:		Signed:	
Dated:	24th April 2024	Dated:	24 April 2024