

Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20230542

Location: 39 St Georges Crescent Gravesend Kent DA12 4AR

Description: Erection of part two storey and part single storey rear extension and single storey side extension.

Applicant: Mrs Laura Vilday

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application Form
Site Location Plan
Existing Block Plan
Proposed Block Plan
23/03/04 01 – Existing Ground Floor Plan
23/03/04 02 – Proposed Ground Floor Plan
23/03/04 03 – Existing and Proposed First Floor Plan
23/03/04 04 – Existing and Proposed Elevations

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20221050	Construction of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, and demolition of the shed.	Refused	25/11/2022
20220835	Construction of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, off road parking to the front, a new pedestrian access and demolition of the shed.	Refused	14/09/2022

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

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)

- Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- Section 12 – Achieving sustainable development and well-designed places

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- SPG 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

Ward Councillors: No response received.

GBC Highways Officer:

I have no highway objections, but the provision of a bedroom does require a secure cycle space to be provided to comply with the requirements of Kent County council's SPG4.

In terms of car parking the difference between a 2 bedroom and a 3 bedroom dwelling is an average of half a space per dwelling. It is noted that the November 22 Street view image shows a dropped kerb having been provided to serve a future parking space. Therefore, any refusal based on the lack of car parking is liable to be unsuccessful.

Neighbouring properties

The final date to submit comments ended on 19th June 2023.

7 surrounding properties were consulted, and no comments were received from members of the public.

Officer's Analysis

This scheme followed recent planning applications which were refused. The proposal were as follows:

20221050: Construction of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, and demolition of the shed.

20220835: Construction of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, off road parking to the front, a new pedestrian access and demolition of the shed.

This current scheme does not include any two storey side extensions or changes to the driveway. The new proposal is substantially different from the two which were previously refused. As such, whilst the reasons for refusal are noted, it would not be necessary to consider whether those refusal reasons are overcome. A full assessment will be undertaken for this new scheme and all material matters considered. Where relevant the assessment may reflect the previous reports for consistency.

Principle of Development

This application is located inside the Urban Boundary, 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 and KCC Highways.

Design, Character and Appearance

The proposed scheme would have minimal impact on the streetscene given the set back and single storey nature of the proposed side extension. It is noted there would be some visibility of this addition from some viewpoints, given the higher level of the road in comparison to the plot. However, merely being visible from the streetscene would not necessarily result in harm to the streetscene. The scale, character and appearance of the addition should be considered to address the extent of its impact.

The proposed extensions, including those to the rear (which would not be visible from the streetscene to any significant degree), would not result in a significant increase in footprint. The part two storey component would have a much lower ridge than the main dwellinghouse. Whilst it is somewhat disappointing that its eave height would be higher than the main dwellinghouse, it would allow for a more symmetrical placement of the opening given the existing first floor window on the rear elevation interrupts the eave and the height difference would not be significant. It is also noted that it would use a pitch reflective of the main dwellinghouse.

The single storey components either side of the two-storey extension would be low form and reduce potential bulk. The single storey, side extension to the south would have a false pitch, which would ideally be a full pitch given the potential viewpoint from the streetscene. However, on its own, this would not result in significant harm to the character of the dwellinghouse. The flat roof to the single storey rear, would have no visibility from the streetscene and would be acceptable in this instance.

The application form details that the external materials would be; brickwork, roof tiles, upvc windows and doors. It is considered that this would be appropriate for this urban, residential setting.

It is considered that the proposed extensions would be appropriate in scale, design and would reflect the character of the area so as to minimise potential harm to the streetscene adequately. 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 NPPF (2021) states that planning decisions should aim to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users. The impact on amenity is also considered with regard to the criteria with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy, which states that new development should be located, designed and constructed to safeguard the amenity, including privacy, daylight and sunlight, of its occupants, and those of neighbouring properties and land. The impact on neighbours will be assessed in the next section of the report.

The proposal would result in sufficiently sized rooms. The existing second bedroom is being reduced from double in size to a single, in order to accommodate the corridor to the extension, but this is considered satisfactory and a choice for the applicant to make. The newly created bedroom is sufficiently sized for a single bedroom. The remaining garden space is sufficient and as such the proposal is compliant with Policy CS19 of the Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and SPG2 Residential Layout Guidelines 2020.

Neighbouring Amenity

As outlined above, it is important that any development safeguards the amenity of neighbouring properties and land. Following a period of consultation with neighbouring properties, no objection to the proposal was

received.

The neighbours most likely to be impacted by the development would be 37 and 29 St Georges Crescent.

37 St Georges Crescent

This neighbour is located to the south. The existing dwellinghouse is approximately 3.4 metres from the shared boundary. The proposed single storey side extension would be 1.1 metres from the shared boundary. However, the two storey elements of the building would retain the existing 3.4 metre distance. There is close boarded fencing at the shared boundary and an existing outbuilding close to the boundary within the neighbours' plot which would somewhat restrict visibility of the extension from this neighbours perspective. Given the arrangement of the proposed extension in terms of the height and design, it is considered that the bulk and massing would not result in significant overbearing bulk or overshadowing to this neighbour's property. There would also be no direct overlooking from first floor resulting from the proposed works. A condition should be included where approved to prevent new openings resulting in unacceptable direct overlook.

29 St Georges Crescent

This neighbour is located to the north and is attached. The proposed single storey rear extension would meet the shared boundary. The two-storey part of the extension would be 2.6m from the shared boundary with this neighbour. No part of the rear extensions would extend further to the rear than this neighbours single storey extension. Given the location, scale, distances and design of the proposed extension it is considered that it would not result in any significant, overbearing bulk or overshadowing to this neighbours amenity. The works would not result in any increased, direct overlook. A condition would be attached where approved, to ensure that new openings would not result in inappropriate overlooking.

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

Highways and Parking

The proposed scheme does not include intended changes to landscape, access or parking provision. Currently parking provision is not available on this site. However, it is noted that there is a dropped kerb in place and so there is potential for future parking provision, subject to necessary planning consents. The GBC Highways officer has not objected to the scheme which does not increase parking provision. They have indicated however that due to the increased bedroom a secure cycle parking space should be provided. Whilst this is not indicated on the proposed plans, it is noted that there is an outbuilding to the rear of the garden which would be capable of storing a bicycle.

Adequate vehicle and cycle parking provision is therefore available in accordance with paragraphs 110 to 113 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Saved Policies T1 and P3 of the Local Plan First Review (1994) and Policies CS11 and CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 subject to further details of cycle parking provision.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposed development complies with all relevant national and local planning policies. The recommendation is therefore to approve.

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

Case Officer:	Miss Lisa Williams	Team Leader:	Miss Faye Hobbs
----------------------	--------------------	---------------------	-----------------

Signed:		Signed:	
Dated:	11th July 2023	Dated:	12 July 2023