

# Delegated Report

## *Householder Planning Application*

---

**Planning Application No:** 20220503

**Location:** 85 Valley Drive Gravesend Kent DA12 5RR

**Description:** Extend the existing vehicular access.

**Applicant:** Mubasirul Islam

**Site Visit Date:** 25.05.22

---

### Submitted Documents/Plans

Application Form;  
Drawing No. 21136 (01) 001 - Block/Site Plan Existing and Site Location Plan;  
Drawing No. 21136 (01) 002 – Floor Plan – Existing;  
Drawing No. 21136 (01) 003 – Front Elevation – Existing;  
Drawing No. 21136 (02) 001 – Block/Site Plan Proposed;  
Drawing No. 21136 (02) 002 – Floor Plan – Proposed;  
Drawing No. 21136 (02) 003 – Front Elevation – Proposed; and  
Supplementary Information – Photograph of Front of the Property.

### Relevant Planning History

No relevant history.

### 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)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards
- T1 - Impact of Development on the 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;
- SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006);
- Kent County Council Vehicle Crossing Guidance and Self-Assessment (2018); and
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021).

### **Consultations, Publicity and Representations**

#### Consultees

##### Gravesham Borough Council – Highways

I have no objections.

##### KCC - Highways & Transportation

Referring to the above description, it would appear that this development proposal does not meet the criteria to warrant involvement from the Highway Authority in accordance with the current consultation protocol arrangements. If there are any material highway safety concerns that you consider should be brought to the attention of the HA, then please contact us again with your specific concerns for our consideration.

**Informative: It is important to note that planning permission does not convey any approval to carry out works on or affecting the public highway.**

#### Ward Councillors

No comments received.

#### Neighbouring properties

A notice was displayed on site 25.05.2022.

In addition, ten surrounding properties were consulted and no representations were received. The consultation period expired 07.06.22.

### **Officer's Analysis**

#### Design, Character and Appearance

85 Valley drive is a two storey semi-detached property. The site is located to the East of the highway, which is also a bus route. The property has a shared dropped kerb and a hard paved front garden which is currently used for parking.



The proposal does not include any changes to the fenestration or to the layout of the front garden and will have little impact on the street scene. Although the extent of the hard landscaping is not ideal, it has been in place in excess of 4 years according to Google Streetview.

Therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of Policy CS19 (LPCS) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021).

#### Amenity of Future Occupiers

The amenity of future occupiers will be safeguarded by the proposal, in accordance with Policy CS19 (LPCS) and Section 12 (NPPF).

#### Neighbouring Amenity

The extension of the vehicular access would not negatively impact neighbouring amenity. It could be considered to improve neighbouring amenity as number 85 Valley Drive currently shares a dropped kerb with number 83. The extension of the vehicular access would mean less impact on the shared dropped kerb. As such, the proposal is in accordance with Policy CS19 (LPCS) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021).

#### Parking and Highways

There are no objections to the development in highway terms.

Valley Drive has a number of vehicle crossovers and accesses, and it is not considered that the proposal to extend the existing access will cause a highways issue, therefore the proposed development is deemed acceptable.

#### Any Other Material Planning Considerations

##### *Archaeology*

The site lies within an area of archaeological potential however, the extension of the vehicular access will not impact on any below ground potential archaeology.

##### *Groundwater Source Protection Zone*

The site lies within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone - Zone 2. The proposed development is unlikely to have an effect on this, considering the area is already hard paved.

##### *Impact on biodiversity*

As mentioned previously within this report, the hard paved frontage has been existing in excess of 4 years.

A small section of grass/lawn is retained. Although this could be considered contrary to the NPPF (2021) Section 15 and is not ideal in terms of soft landscaping and biodiversity, the Local Planning Authority cannot object to the lack of biodiversity on site and therefore the proposal is considered acceptable.

### **Conclusion & Recommendation**

The proposed extension to the existing vehicular access will have a minimal impact on the street scene as there are no fenestration or parking layout changes proposed. The small amount of soft landscaping is not ideal, but the existing hard paved frontage has been in place for a number of years, and so this is not considered sufficient reason to refuse the proposal. The development protects the amenity of future occupiers and neighbours, and is acceptable in terms of parking and highways.

The application has been fully considered and is in accordance with local and national planning policy.

### **Recommendation**

Permission

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

|                      |                 |                     |                     |
|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Case Officer:</b> | Mrs Lucy Hankin | <b>Team Leader:</b> | <b>Richard Hart</b> |
| <b>Signed:</b>       | L Hankin        | <b>Signed:</b>      | <i>R Hart</i>       |
| <b>Dated:</b>        | 20.06.22        | <b>Dated:</b>       | <b>21 June 2022</b> |