



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20231030

Location: 13 Steadman Close Higham Rochester Kent

Description: Demolition of existing garage and porch and erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, one dormer window in the front roof slope and alterations to fenestration including relocation of main front door from side to front elevation; demolition of existing shed and erection of outbuilding in of rear garden to form an annexe ancillary to the existing dwelling.

Applicant: Mr C Rayfield

Site Visit Date: 17 November 2023

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application form;
Drawing no. P01 Rev. P1 – Existing Block Plan;
Drawing no. P02 Rev. P2 – Proposed Block Plan;
Drawing no. P03 Rev. P1 – Existing Plans; and
Drawing no. P04 Rev. P2 – Proposed Annex & side extension.

Superseded drawings

~~Drawing no. P02 Rev. P1 – Proposed Block Plan;~~
~~Drawing no. P04 Rev. P1 – Proposed Annex & side extension~~

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20030943	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension to form study, utility room and shower room.	Certificate Granted	10.12.2003

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 (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); and
- Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment (2009).

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

KCC Heritage

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

Dickens Protection Society

Society has no objection to the extension of the house but objects to the proposed annex which is suitable for separate occupation.

No response from:

Higham Parish Council

Neighbouring properties

11 surrounding properties were consulted – overall consultation expiry date was 06.11.2023 – no responses received.

Officer's Analysis

The application site consists of a two storey semi-detached dwelling situated on the eastern side of Steadman Close. It has a detached garage with a gated access between the garage and the dwelling providing access to the rear garden. There is an existing outbuilding at the rear of the garden. The site is located in Higham a rural settlement inset from the Green Belt and in the Higham Arable Farmlands Landscape Character Area.

The proposal is for demolition of existing garage and porch and erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, one dormer window in the front roof slope and alterations to fenestration

including relocation of main front door from side to front elevation; demolition of existing shed and erection of outbuilding in of rear garden to form an annexe ancillary to the existing dwelling.

The existing detached garage would be removed and the two storey side extension erected. It would be 4.2m in width, extend the full depth of the dwelling (excluding the single storey element) and be the same height as the host dwelling, 8m. There would be a dormer window in the front roof slope. It would be faced with matching brickwork and tiles.

The existing outbuilding would be demolished and a new outbuilding constructed to form an annex. The existing outbuilding is 8.3m in width and 3.2m in depth. The proposed annex building would be 10m in width, 6m in depth and 3.5m in height to the top of the ridgeline. It would have a door and four windows in the front elevation and no openings in any of the other elevations. Internally there would be a bedroom, living/kitchen, wc and store cupboards.

The existing plans are as follows:



The proposed plans are as follows:

The application site comprises a semi-detached two storey dwelling and its curtilage. This property has a long rear garden at the end of which is an existing outbuilding. The existing outbuilding would be demolished and the annex erected in its place. Whilst the proposed annex would provide facilities that might allow for independent day to day living, in this case the applicant has applied for an annex and has advised that the annex would be occupied by a close family member. As a family member they would therefore be likely to share various living activities within the family in the main dwelling. The whole of the site of 13 Steadman Close would remain as a single unit and the garden area is capable of being shared. The floorspace of the annex would also be far smaller than the floorspace of the main dwelling. All of these matters point to the ancillary nature of the annex and the site as a whole would remain for single family occupation and one planning unit. The proposed development would therefore not constitute a separate dwelling but would be an annex to the main dwelling. If permission is forthcoming conditions will be required to limit the permission to ancillary accommodation and to define the permission and to prevent the use of the building as a separate dwelling.

Design, Character and Appearance

The Council's Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) states that two storey side extensions can have a significant impact on the appearance of the street. It states that two storey side extensions should be designed in line with the following guidance. Extensions should generally aim to appear subservient to the host 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. The height should not exceed the eaves height of the host building. Extensions should generally be no greater than half the width of the host building and the existing rhythm of the street, including for example characteristic gaps between properties, the symmetry of pairs of semi-detached homes or groups of terraced houses, should not unreasonably be interrupted and that a minimum gap of 1m should be retained between the extension and the flank boundary. Extensions are of greater visibility, and should incorporate roof designs to reflect and generally be subservient to the main property's roof. Patterns of windows should reflect the host building and local character. There should be matching external facing materials.

In this case the proposed extension would not be set back from the main front wall or down from the ridgeline of the host dwelling. However, in this case this is considered acceptable as the property already has a projecting two storey gable feature. To then set the extension back beyond this would lead to an overly fussy front elevation. As such whilst a set back from the main front wall and a set down from the ridgeline would normally be requested, it is considered that in this case due to the existing character of the dwelling with a mansard roof and projecting gable feature, that such a set back and set down would not be appropriate here. For these reasons the extension can be accepted with no set back and set down in this case.

The eaves height of the extension would not exceed the eaves height of the host dwelling. In respect to the point on width above i.e. that extensions should be no greater than half the width of the dwelling it is noted that the proposed extension would be slightly over this but it is considered that the width does not appear overly large and that the extension would be set in 1m from the side boundary and therefore this slight extra over half of the existing width of the dwelling is considered acceptable on this occasion. The roof design would match the existing host dwelling. One request that was made was to retain the existing dormer in the front roof slope as it is and not replace it with a new larger dormer; the other new dormer proposed in the front roof slope was considered acceptable. The addition of a two storey side extension but with the retention of the existing dormer can be seen at no. 21 Steadman Close and it is considered that this approach would be beneficial and should be replicated here. The agent was asked to amend the plans to show the existing dormer retained and this has accordingly been done. The extension would be faced with brickwork and tiles to match the existing dwelling.

The relocation of the front door from the side elevation to the front elevation is considered an acceptable alteration in design terms.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be the same depth as the existing single storey rear extension and just continue along behind the proposed two storey side extension and continue the existing mono pitched roof form. It would have matching materials to the host dwelling and is considered acceptable in scale and design.

In respect of the proposed demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of a new outbuilding for the annex, the Council's Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) states the following in respect of outbuildings.

Outbuildings should not deprive the existing property of adequate private garden space and should be subordinate in scale to the existing dwelling and to the plot. Factors such as the scale, height, proximity to boundaries, roof design, finishing materials and prominence in the street scene or rear garden environment will be considered. Outbuildings should not detract from the character of the area (this is especially important where the outbuilding will be visible from the street) and should be unobtrusively located to the side and rear of the existing dwelling.

In this case the proposed outbuilding would be 59.6 sq. m and the existing dwelling is 97.5 sq. m. The outbuilding would be located at the bottom of the garden and there would ample garden space remaining. The outbuilding would therefore be subordinate in scale to the existing dwelling. The outbuilding would be located up against the rear and side boundaries but its height would be modest at 3.5m to the top of the pitched roof and is therefore of acceptable scale and design and would be located at the bottom of the rear garden. It would have a render finish and tiles with all materials to match existing dwelling.

In summary, the proposed two storey side extension in its amended form with the existing dormer retained, would be an acceptable addition which would respect the existing scale and character of the host dwelling and the proposed outbuilding as an annex would be of subordinate size and acceptable design. In respect of design, character and appearance the proposal is considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS) and section 12 of the NPPF (2023).

Impact on Landscape Character

The application site is located in the Higham Arable Farmlands Landscape Character Area and as such, Policy CS12 (LPCS) is relevant. This policy states that the overall landscape character of the Borough will be conserved, restored and enhanced and that the Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment will be taken into account in determining applications.

The area the site is located within an area of planned residential roads within Lower Higham with a number of dwellings, it is fairly built up and not particularly rural in character inside this area. Given this context it is therefore considered that there would be no adverse impact on the landscape character. As such, the proposal would be compliant with Policy CS12 (LPCS) and section 15 of the NPPF (2023).

Occupier Amenity

The rear garden area between the rear extension and the annex would be 260 sq. m and the rear garden depth from the rear extension to the annex would be 19.7m; the garden area and depth would therefore exceed the minimum standards as set out in SPG2 (2020) for a dwelling with four or more bedrooms.

In respect of the two new bedrooms in the extension, the front bedroom would be 13.8 sq. m and the rear bedroom would be 13.1 sq. m and would therefore exceeds the minimum standard for a double bedroom as set out in the Technical Housing Standards (2015) of 11.5 sq. m.

In respect of the annex the living/kitchen would be served by two windows in the front and the glazed double doors; the bedroom would be served by two windows in the front and the wc. would be served by a window in the side. As annex accommodation, the proposed rooms would be adequately sized for their stated function, and they would receive reasonable levels of light and ventilation.

As the scheme would be an annex, it is not necessary for it to comply with the floorspace and storage

standards for a one person dwelling set out in national guidance or local policy.

In respect of occupier amenity the proposal is considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Neighbouring Amenity

Due to the distance of the proposed two storey side extension from the neighbouring properties to the north of where the extension would be, i.e. nos. 9 & 11 Steadman Close, some 14m, there would be no overshadowing, loss of light or loss of outlook to those properties. There are no windows proposed at first floor level and at ground floor level there are just two high level windows which would serve the garage, therefore no overlooking issues to no. 9 & 11 either.

Similarly the single storey rear extension which would just continue the existing single storey rear extension across behind the proposed two storey side extension and due to its scale would have no impact on the properties to the north of where the extension would be i.e. principally no. 9 Steadman Close.

With regards the annex this would replace an existing outbuilding on the site. The existing outbuilding is 8.3m in width and 3.2m in depth. The proposed annex building would be 10m in width, 6m in depth and 3.5m in height to the top of the ridgeline. The annex would be 1.7m wider and double the depth but due to its modest height (2.5m to the eaves and 3.5m to the ridge) and the distance of the surrounding properties (there is some 12.2m to the nearest point of the nearest property to the north no. 3 Steadman Close and some 15.4m to the nearest point of the nearest property to the east no. 15 Alexandar Cottages, School Lane) there would be no overshadowing, loss of light or loss of outlook caused to those properties. The windows would all face down into the garden of the application dwelling itself. The bathroom window in the south flank elevation would face onto the rear part of the garden of no. 15 Steadman Close so would not overlook any windows in that property's rear elevation or its private garden area; it would also be obscure glazed.

Overall in respect of neighbouring amenity there would be no harmful impact and in regard to this matter the proposal is compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Parking and Highway Safety

The existing dwelling would increase from a three to a four bedroom dwelling. The existing detached garage would be demolished under the proposals but a new garage would be at the ground floor level of the proposed two storey side extension which would have an internal width and depth of 4m and 7.8m respectively and therefore exceed the minimum garage size as set out in SPG4(2006). The front of the property is also all hard paved for parking. There would therefore be space for some 3-4 vehicles and as such the property would achieve the maximum parking standards for a dwelling with 4 or more bedrooms as set out in SPG4 (2006). In respect of parking and highway safety the proposal is therefore considered compliant with saved Policy P3 (LPFR).

Archaeology

The site lies within an area of multi-period archaeological potential. However, KCC consider it unlikely that these proposals, adjacent to the existing dwelling, would have a significant below-ground archaeological impact and therefore have no further comments to make. Therefore, in respect of archaeology the proposal is considered compliant with saved Policy TC7 (LPFR).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

Conclusion & Recommendation

The application is considered to be acceptable in respect of the proposed annex would be ancillary to the main dwelling and not a separate dwelling unit, the proposal overall would be acceptable in respect of design character and appearance, landscape character, occupier and neighbouring amenity, parking and

highway safety and archaeology. The proposal would therefore be compliant with local and national planning policy.

(For detailed conditions and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:	<i>Rebecca Harrison</i>	Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	13th February 2024	Dated:	14th February 2024