



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20220558

Location: 53 Hollybush Road Gravesend Kent DA12 5QG

Description: Erection of a part single, part two storey side extension, conversion of the existing garage to form habitable rooms

Applicant: Amrik Photay

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application Form Dated 24 May 2022;
Drawing no. 01 (Site Location Plan);
Drawing no. 02 (Block Plan);
Drawing no. 03 (Existing Floorplans, Elevations and 3D Views);
Drawing no. 04 Revision C (Proposed Floorplans, Elevations and Section) REVISED;
Drawing no. 04A Revision C (Proposed 3D Visuals) REVISED; and
Photographs.

~~Drawing no. 04A (Proposed Elevations, Floorplans and Section) SUPERSEDED~~
~~Drawing no. 04A (Proposed 3D Views) SUPERSEDED~~

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20220564	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of a rear dormer, conversion of the roof space into habitable rooms and installation of front rooflights.	Certificate Granted	22 July 2022

20220085	Erection of a part single, part two storey side extension, conversion of the existing garage to form habitable rooms, erection of a rear dormer, installation of rooflights in the front roof slope and conversion of the roofspace to form habitable rooms.	Refusal	28 April 2022
----------	--	---------	---------------

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
- Impact of Development on 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

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

GBC Highways Officer

Having given this careful consideration and compared it to the previous application 20220085, my views remain unchanged regarding the need to maintain two car parking spaces.

1. The number of bedroom is suggested to be three but the library could easily be repurposed increase the bedrooms to four and there is an unspecified use for the roof space. This would occur whilst the possibility of onsite parking is reduced. So in the interests of nil detriment the application should be refused as presented. It is noted that the garage may not conform to current standards, but as it was provided as a garage the intent must have been to park a car and even today it can accommodate some of the smaller vehicles on the road and so it is counted as a parking space. The double gate adjacent to the garage can provide access to the back flank of the property where an additional

vehicle could be parked, so even excluding the garage two cars can be parked on site, but the side extension would prevent this.



2. Gravesham Borough Council's adopted supplementary guidance for residential parking is for a maximum provision, but this guidance is dated and does not reflect current practice of not setting maximum provisions as a guidance. Kent County Council as Highway Authority have more recent guidance and for a four bedroom property in a suburban area this is for two spaces as a minimum to be provided.

It would however appear by setting back the side extension some 500mm in the current proposal, it should be possible to provide 2 side by side parking spaces, albeit at a reduced depth of 4.8 metres as opposed to 5 metres in SPG4. Whilst not ideal 4.8 metres is the depth required in the Kent County Council guidance for carriage crossovers and is often recognised as national standard, rather than a local one.

Looking at Google Street View for May 2018



The property already benefits from a dropped kerb along the frontage where the parking would occur, so it is just the removal of part of the wall and the gates that prevent readily accessible parking being provided. By keeping the parking in front of the proposed extension as far as is possible, the necessary pedestrian sight lines can be retained. I would suggest this should be a pre-commencement condition, the cost appears minimal and it protects the car parking provision for the dwelling.

So, subject to a suitable parking plan for two vehicles, that can be a condition, it appears a suitable compromise is possible

GBC Environmental Protection (Regulatory Services)

Please include the Watching Brief condition, the code of construction informative and the smoke control informative.

KCC Archaeology

The site lies within an area of multi-period archaeological potential. However it is considered unlikely that these proposals, immediately adjacent to the existing dwelling, would have a significant below-ground archaeological impact

Neighbouring properties

11 surrounding properties were consulted and a site notice was also displayed. The overall consultation period expired on 19 July 2022 and no representations have been received.

Officer's Analysis

This application has been submitted following a recent refusal for a similar form of development – reference 20220085. The application was refused on the following grounds;

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its size, bulk and design, would not be subservient to the existing building and would add significant bulk to a very publicly visible side elevation and to the rear elevation. As such, the proposal would be out of character with the existing building, detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and would be contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014), to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and to the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide SPD 2021.
2. The proposal would make insufficient provision for the parking of cars within the site in accordance with the Borough Council's adopted Vehicle Parking Standards and would be likely to lead to cars parking on the public highway, inconvenient to other road users and detrimental to highway safety. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS11 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014) and Saved Policies T1 and P5 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review November 1994.
3. The proposed development, by virtue of its design and proximity to neighbouring properties, would lead to a detrimental level of overlooking impacts to the side bedroom window of no. 51 Hollybush Road. As such, the proposed development would be detrimental to the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers and contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014, to the Residential Layout Guidelines 2020 and to Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Design, Character and Appearance

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF 2021) sets out various design requirements and includes the need for the development to add to the overall quality of an area; be visually attractive; and be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 sets out that new development will be visually attractive, fit for purpose and locally distinctive. It should conserve and enhance the character of the built environment and take account of the scale, height, building lines and other architectural features of buildings. Account should also be taken of strategic views, site topography, the significance of heritage assets and features of townscape and landscape value which contribute to local character and sense of place.

The Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide SPD 2021 requires two storey side extensions (amongst other things) to be set back behind the front building line, to not exceed the existing eaves height and to be less than half of the width of the host building, with a minimum gap of one metre from the side boundary.

The application property is an end of terrace, two storey dwelling with three bedrooms located in a residential area. The existing side elevation of the building is a prominent feature in the street scene, as the adjacent property is a bungalow.



The proposal is for the erection of a part single, part two storey side extension and the conversion of the existing garage to form habitable rooms

The first ground of refusal was based on design and the bulk and massing of the proposed extension. It was not in accordance with the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide SDP by not being subservient in design and adding excess bulk and massing. This has been addressed by setting the two storey side extension back behind the front elevation of the original dwelling, and also setting the ridge line down. The rear dormer has also been removed, which has been applied for separately under a lawful development certificate. The plans initially submitted with this application included a hipped roof, but this resulted in a large flat roof which is not acceptable for a two storey extension. The single storey element of the side extension was also flat roof which looked at odds with the rest of the proposal

The agent was contacted who amended the plans by adding a pitched roof to the single storey side extension and a gabled roof to the two storey extension. Although this adds some bulk, overall it is more in keeping the terrace, and has still been designed in a subservient manner. The extension has also been set further back. The proposed facing materials (red brick and white render and grey concrete tiles) and main roof design would match with the existing building. Overall, these changes are considered to have overcome the first ground of refusal from the previous submission and the proposal is in accordance with the development and design principles of CS19 of the Local Plan First Review and the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide SPD.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

The proposed development results in the reconfiguration of first floor of the property, with the existing third bedroom becoming a gym, and a new third bedroom proposed in the side extension, along with a library. Taken on face value, there is no increase in the number of bedrooms at the property. However the library and gym could easily be used as single bedrooms. The minimum size requirements set out in the Nationally Described Space Standard 2015 for a single bedroom is 6.5m². The library falls slightly foul of this at 6m², but the gym is 7m². On balance, if these rooms did become bedrooms, they are adequately sized.

According to the Residential Layout Guidelines 2020 (RLG 2020), a four or more bedroom property should have a minimum garden area of 100 square metres and a minimum depth of 10 metres. Although the property is currently remaining three bedroom, the application site has a private garden area of some 180 square metres with a depth of some 22 metres, which more than complies with the RLG 2020 for a larger property.

Overall, the proposed development would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers and sufficient garden area would be retained. As such, the proposal would not be detrimental to residential amenity and would be in line with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014.

Neighbouring Amenity

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF 2021 requires developments to create places with a high standard of amenity for existing users. Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 requires new development to be located, designed and constructed to safeguard the amenity, including privacy, daylight and sunlight, of surrounding occupiers. In this regard the Residential Layout Guidelines (RLG 2020) are relevant.

The closest residential properties to the application site are no. 51 Hollybush Road (located immediately to the west) and no. 55 Hollybush Road (located immediately to east). To the south are no. 1 Arnold Road and no. 1 Lamorna Avenue. To the north, across the roadway are nos. 48, 50 and 52 Hollybush Road.

The third ground of refusal from 20220085 related to the impact on no. 51 Hollybush Road. No. 51 Hollybush Road has two windows in the side elevations that face the application site (a bedroom and hallway) and windows in the front and rear elevations that are located close to the boundary (a bedroom at the front and an en-suite at the rear). The side boundary treatment adjacent to the side bedroom window is an approximately one metre tall wall. Due to the low boundary treatment and proximity of the buildings, there would be adverse overlooking impacts from the proposed ground floor kitchen window to the bedroom window at no. 51 Hollybush Road, which would be detrimental to residential amenity. To overcome this issues, a high level window has been proposed to serve the kitchen. This will also be conditioned to be obscure glazed about 1.7 metres to ensure privacy is adequately safeguarded. As such the previous ground of refusal has been overcome. In terms of other impacts, due to the separation and orientation of the buildings, there would be no significant adverse overshadowing or overbearing impact to the occupiers of no. 51 Hollybush Road. No representations have been received.

Due to the separation and orientation of the buildings, there would be no adverse overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impacts to the occupiers of nos. 48 to 52 Hollybush Road, no. 1 Arnold Road and no. 1 Lamorna Avenue.

Due to the positioning of the proposed development at the side of the application property, there would be no adverse overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impacts to the occupiers of no. 55 Hollybush Road.

No neighbour representations have been received.

Overall it is considered that the previous concerns regarding loss of privacy have been overcome and the application is now safeguards neighbour amenity in accordance with Policy CS19 of the Local Plan Core Strategy 2014.

Parking and Highways

The application is currently three bedroom, with an attached garage at the side. The front garden is fully hard paved. The lack of parking provision was the second ground of refusal.

The loss of the garage is acceptable subject to the provision of adequate off-street parking provision. Based on the presumption of the property being four bed, the adopted Vehicle Parking Standards would require a maximum provision of three parking spaces at the application site. However it is noted that the Highway Authority have more recent guidance that would require a minimum of two spaces to be provided for a four

bedroom property in a suburban area.

It was considered that there is the potential for two spaces at the front of the side extension, utilising the existing crossover. However the space must be 4.8 metres deep which resulted in the extension needing to be set back further to accommodate this. The Agent has happy to oblige this, and also removed the existing gates from the proposal as these would hindered accessibility. A condition will also be attached ensuring no gates in reinstalled.

Following the submission of the revised plan, it is considered that the previous ground of refusal has been overcome and there is a adequate parking provision at the property.

As such the proposal would make sufficient provision for the parking of cars within the site in accordance with the Borough Council's adopted Vehicle Parking Standards. The proposal is in accordance with Policy CS11 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014) and Saved Policies T1 and P5 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review November 1994.

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

The application site is located in an area of multi-period archaeological potential and Kent County Council Heritage considers it unlikely that the proposed works would have a significant archaeological impact. As such, the proposal would be in line with Policy CS20 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014) and Saved Policy TC7 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review November 1994.

The application site is located within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 2. However, as the proposed development would be within the confines of an existing residential garden with relatively few groundworks, then it is considered that there would be no adverse impacts to groundwater.

The application site is located within the buffer zone for the Holyoake Mount historic landfill site and the GBC Environmental Protection Team have set out the wording for a watching brief condition. Therefore provided that this condition is attached to any planning permission granted, then there would be no adverse contamination impacts.

The application site is located in a smoke control area. As such, advice regarding smokeless fuels/appliances can be given to the applicant in an informative attached to any planning permission granted.

Conclusion

The application has been fully considered in relation to the previous grounds of refusal from 20220085. The revisions to the design and securing of adequate off street parking provision are acceptable and it is considered that the application can be supported. The proposed extension is in accordance with local and national planning policy, the development is not excessive in size, bulk or height, will be constructed in suitable materials and will have no impact on the wider street scene. Furthermore there will be no impact on the amenity of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the parking arrangement at the property.

Recommendation

Permission

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

Case Officer:	Miss Faye Hobbs	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:		Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>

Dated:	25th July 2022	Dated:	25 th July 2022
---------------	----------------	---------------	----------------------------