



Delegated Report

Householder Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20221112

Location: 2 Hays Mead Henley Street Luddesdown Gravesend

Description: Erection of single storey rear extension with lantern to provide extended kitchen & dining with utility room.

Applicant: Mr Terence Fuller

Site Visit Date: 10/11/2022

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application Form;
Site Location Plan;
TF/PA 01 – Site Plan;
TF/PA 02 – Existing Plans;
TF/PA 03 – Proposed Plans;
TF/PA 04 – Existing Elevations;
TF/PA 05 – Proposed Elevations;
TF/PA 06 – Proposed Section; and
Design and Access Statement.

Superseded

~~TF/RE 01 – Site Plan~~
~~TF/RE 02 – Existing Plans;~~
~~TF/RE 03 – Proposed Plan~~
~~TF/RE 04 – Existing Elevations;~~
~~TF/RE 05 – Proposed Elevation~~
~~TF/RE 06 – Proposed Section~~

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20220498	Erection of a double storey side extension and renewable energy heating system consisting of air sourced heat pump.	Permitted	03/08/2022
19850759 (GR/85/759W)	Erection of single storey side extension to form study and dining room	Permitted	09/12/0985
19830711 (GR/82/711)	Construction of dormer extension in rear roof slope to form an additional bedroom	Permitted	21/12/1983

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)

- C13 – Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside
- T1 – Impact of Development on the Highway Network
- 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 9 – Promoting sustainable transport
- Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- Section 13 – Protecting Green Belt land
- Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- SPG2 – Residential Layout Guidelines (2020).
- SPG4 – KCC Parking Standards (2006).
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021)
- Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard (2015);
- Landscape Character Assessment (2009)
- Kent Downs AONB Management Plan 2021-2026

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

The consultation and neighbour publicity period expired on 18th November. This included the erection of a site notice.

Consultees

Ward Councillors - No Comment Received.

Luddesdown Parish Council - The Parish Council wishes to raise the following comments on the above application:

- The Council raises no objection to the application other than to express concern around the proposed external cladding which contrasts with the existing appearance of the property and neighbouring properties.
- If the Council is minded to grant approval, we would therefore request that a condition be applied for details of the proposed external cladding materials to be submitted to the planning authority for approval in order to secure a more sympathetic appearance to the existing built environment.

Neighbouring properties

2no. surrounding properties were consulted, and no comments were received.

Officer's Analysis

Description of Site

The property is located within the rural area of Gravesham, within the Green Belt, within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and within the Meopham Downs Landscape Character Area. No. 2 is a two-storey semi-detached single dwelling on a good size plot, with a garden to the front and a driveway leading to a detached garage towards the rear of the house. It is noted that the site has extant approval for a two-storey side extension. Works for this development have not commenced. However, the applicant has shown the approved side extension on the plans, making clear the intention to undertake this development as a cumulative development with the approved side extension rather than as an alternative.

The immediate street scene is largely characterised by semi-detached houses in spacious plots. The site has recent planning consent for a two-storey side extension which is shown on the proposed plans. Therefore, this proposal is in addition to that previous approval rather than being an alternative.

Proposal

The proposal is to erect a single storey flat roof extension to the rear with a roof lantern above. It would use timber cladding. It would have openings to the rear (north-east) and to the side (south-east). It should be noted that the application has been negotiated on with the depth of the extension being decreased. The plans have also been amended to clarify that the side extension does not part of this application.

Summary Information

	Proposed Extension (m)
Max height	3.3 (including roof lantern)
Max eaves height	2.9
Max Width	5.9
Max Depth	4.5

Main Issues

The main issues for consideration with this pre-application proposal are as follows:

- Principle of development in the Green Belt
- Landscape character
- Design, character and appearance
- Residential amenity
- Highways

Principle of Development

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraphs 147-151 of the NPPF address proposals which would affect the Green Belt. It seeks to ensure that inappropriate development in the Green Belt would not be approved except in very special circumstance.

The relevant exceptions to this policy are as follows:

Paragraph 149(c) identifies *'the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in*

disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building', as an exception to this policy.

Paragraph 149(g) identifies another exception as;

'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or*
- not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority'*

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014

Core Policy CS02 sets out where development should be distributed in the borough. Preference is given to those urbanised area as sustainable locations. Outside urbanised areas, those rural settlements which are inset from the Green Belt would also be considered acceptable in principle. This site is in a rural area, in the Greenbelt **NOT** forming part of settlement inset from the Greenbelt. In this context the policy states that developments; *'will be supported where it is compatible with national policies for protecting the Green Belt and policies in this plan.'*

Saved Policies in the Gravesham Local Plan First Review 1994

Policy C13 sets out the requirements for extensions to dwellings. Of particular consideration and to assist in assessing whether the addition would be disproportionate, this policy limits the increased floorspace to one third of the gross floor area of the original dwelling. However, this policy does pre-date the NPPF, and greater weight should be given where the approach is consistent with paragraph 149 the NPPF 2021.

"Original dwelling" for the purpose of Policy C13 means the building in permanent residential use at 1st July 1948. Whilst there is some planning history relating to the property, this does not appear to have been implemented. The existing conservatory (9.5m²) is not original (it is not on the plans relating to the 1983 permission) and would not therefore be counted within what is the original floor area of the dwelling.

As assessed in the most recent application, the original dwelling has a gross floor area of approximately 104m².

	Original gross external floor area (m²)	Gross external floor area (m²) post-1948 extensions	Approved gross external floor area – 20220498 (m²)	Proposed gross external floor area (m²)	Difference in gross external floor area between original and proposed (m²)
Dwelling (ground and first floor)	104	113.5 (>9.5)	150 (>36.5)	172.65 (>22.65)	>68.65
Percentage		≥9%	≥32%	≥15%	≥40%

As a result of this extension there would be an approximate 40% increase in floor space from that of the original dwellinghouse which would be beyond the one third floorspace limit applied by this policy. It should be noted however that this policy applies this floor space limit *'unless the increased floorspace has no overall effect on the existing bulk and appearance of the dwelling'*.

Therefore, consideration of the effect on the existing bulk and appearance of the dwelling would also be required, this would link to the assessment on the Design, Character and Appearance.

Design, Character and Appearance

Existing Character

This site is located in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), where greater weight is placed on the impact to the character of the Area. The site is also within the Meopham Downs Landscape Character Area.

Effect on Existing Bulk and Appearance

In this instance, the proposed single storey rear extension would be located to the rear and would not be visible from the streetscene. As such, its impact on the character of the Area and the AONB would be limited. However, the scale and design of the addition should be visually subservient, and visually reflective of the mixed rural/residential character of the site, built to a high quality.

The proposed extension would be 4.5 metres deep, although greater than the 3m depth usually allowed under permitted development rights, given the low flat form roof and the existing 8.4m depth of the dwellinghouse at two-storey level, this would not dominate the existing dwellinghouse in a disproportional manner albeit slightly deeper than would have been preferred but improved from the extent originally proposed.

The proposed use of timber would not reflect the existing brick elevations of the building. However, timber cladding is a common material on residential extensions and outbuildings and can serve to provide a more neutral and less imposing appearance than a reflective brick may. It is also noted that timber additions are more commonplace in the rural area and so, this would be a positive contributor to the mixed rural/residential character of the wider albeit at a limited visibility from the public arena.

Given the minor scale of the increase at single storey and the appropriate design and materiality of the proposed extension it would therefore be considered as having '*no overall effect on the existing bulk and appearance of the dwelling*', in line with saved policy C13. It has also been assessed as not resulting 'in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building' in line with NPPF paragraph 149(C) and therefore also complies with Core Policy CS02.

Impact on Openness

The site can be described as previously developed land as it is an existing residential site. As the proposal would not provide affordable housing, the proposal can be judged against the first part of paragraph 149(g), which seeks to prevent a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development on a site. In this case, the proposal is likely to be considered as an appropriate development but its impact on the openness of the Green Belt must be also assessed, and in turn the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Paragraph 137 of the NPPF 2021 states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It also states that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. Paragraph 001 of the Planning Practice Guidance 2019 on Green Belts looks to assess the impact of a proposal on the openness of the Green Belt by taking into account the spatial and visual aspects of a development, its duration and remediability, and the activity levels generated.

As discussed, the site is located within the countryside, and is part of a small development of semi-detached and detached rural houses in spacious plots. There are open fields surrounding these dwellings to the north and south.

The single storey extension would not project excessively to the rear. The proposed extension by virtue of its size and location would not be visible to the front. Batts Road which runs to the east and north is bounded by tree planting which would obscure visibility from potential vantage points. No further changes are proposed to the side spacing between from neighbouring properties as a result of this development. Significant depth of the garden would be retained. Cumulatively, these factors ensure that the development would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Greenbelt than the existing dwellinghouse.

Summary of Principle, Design, Character, and Appearance

Given the minor scale of the increase at single storey and the appropriate design and materiality of the proposed extension it would therefore be considered as having '*no overall effect on the existing bulk and appearance of the dwelling*', in line with saved policy C13. It has also been assessed as not resulting '*in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building*' in line with NPPF paragraph 149(C) and as having '*no greater impact on*' or causing '*substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt*' as required by NPPF Paragraph 149(G). The development therefore also complies with Core Policy CS02. On balance, the proposed development would also 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 extension would not result in additional bedrooms. Based on the details provided, the altered kitchen/dining area would comply with the required space standards. The footprint of the building would have a minor change and the existing garden space would be compliant with required space and depth standards.

The proposal would therefore comply with SPG2 - Residential layout guidelines including Housing Standards Policy Statement October 2015 Adopted 1996 – amended June 2020.

Neighbouring Amenity

There are 2no. adjoining neighbours which would be potentially impacted by the development. 1 Hays Mead, to the west and 3 Hays Mead to the east.

1 Hays Mead

This neighbour is located to the west and is attached. The proposed extension would be 0.3 metres from the shared boundary, retaining the existing fence. The flat roof of this 4.5 metres deep extension would be 2.9 metres high. This flat roof (excluding the roof lantern) would only project by 0.4m above the existing fence line. Its impact on this neighbouring property would therefore be minimal in terms of bulk and overshadowing. There would be no upper floor side openings created as a result of the development and so there is no concern with regard to potential increased direct overlook between the properties.

3 Hays Mead

This neighbour is located to the east. There is 1.32m between the dwellinghouses currently. The approved side extension would reduce this distance to 0.75m. The proposed rear extension would match the 1.32m distance of the original dwellinghouse. There is some fencing between these neighbours although it appears to have fallen into some disrepair with panels missing and so there is some overlooking between the buildings. However, the option to repair the fence remains available and if that repair were undertaken the visibility between the buildings would be significantly reduced. Regarding the impact from the rear extension, given the distance single storey nature with low flat roof, potential reduction of overlook as a result of fence repair and lack of upper floor side openings, it is considered that the harm this proposed development would cause the residential amenity of this neighbour would be negligible.

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

Highways & Parking

On the basis that the number of bedrooms would not change as a result of the proposed development, there is unlikely to be a significant impact on parking provision or highway safety, and therefore no conflict with Saved Policies C11 and CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 or SPG4 – KCC Parking

Standards (2006).

Other Matters

It is noted that the parish have raised concerns with regard to the use of cladding on the proposed rear extension. However timber cladding is a common material used on residential extensions. Oftentimes it is favoured in more rural areas as a more neutral and subservient appearance. Of benefit of using a different material is also that a visual separation between the original and newer elements of the building such as with the case with modern extensions to dwellinghouses or heritage value, thus softening the impact of the additional bulk on the original dwellinghouse. It is also noted that the materials would not be seen from the public perspective. Based on this assessment it is considered unreasonable to require further details of the materials used given the limited impact on the character of the area and the appropriateness of the materials chosen.

Conclusion & Recommendation

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

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

Case Officer:	Ms Lisa Williams	Team Leader:	Miss Faye Hobbs
Signed:		Signed:	
Dated:	5 th December 2022	Dated:	06 December 2022