



Council

Tuesday, 13 April 2021

Dear Councillor

You are advised that the attached documents form part of the main agenda papers for this meeting.

Please ensure you bring them with you to the meeting.

Yours faithfully



S Walsh
Service Manager (Communities)

List of documents attached

- e) Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 7 April 2021 (Pages 3 - 6)

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee**Wednesday, 7 April 2021****7.00 pm****Present:**

Cllr Lauren Sullivan (Chair)
Cllr Harold Craske (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Conrad Broadley
Brian Francis
Bob Lane
Jordan Meade
Elizabeth Mulheran
Tony Rice
Steve Thompson

Wendy Lane Assistant Director (Planning)
Richard Hart Team Leader (Development Management)
Laura Caiels Lawyer (Place)(Medway Council)
David Herrington Digital Manager
Lauren Wallis Committee Services Officer (minutes)

39. Apologies for absence

No apologies for absence were received.

40. To sign the Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 6 January 2021 were signed by the Chair.

41. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest made.

42. Planning applications for determination by the Board**42.1 20210058 - Land at junction with Davis Avenue and Rosebank Gardens, Northfleet, Gravesend, Kent DA11 8RZ - Erection of a single storey dwelling with associated works.**

The Committee considered application reference 20210058 in relation to land of the junction with Davis Avenue and Rosebank Gardens, Northfleet for the erection of a single storey one bedroom dwelling with one parking space. The proposed single storey house would be positioned on a narrow strip of land adjacent Sherwood Cottage, a bungalow on Davis

Avenue, and the entrance to the rear access to the houses between Rosebank Gardens to the south and Davis Avenue to the north.

The Principal Planner (Major Sites) introduced the report and advised that the proposed dwelling and single storey car port to its side would take up the majority of the plot. The rear elevation would also make up the rear boundary of the new dwelling. The accommodation would comprise a single bedroom, a shower room, a living/kitchen/diner area and an entrance lobby. The site was within the urban area where principle of development was acceptable.

The Committee noted that outline planning permission had been granted for a dwelling in 2004 which had not been implemented and had since expired. This application had been approved in line with previous local and national planning policies and, as such, this was not a material planning consideration.

It had therefore been concluded that the proposed dwelling would sit on a prominent and obviously smaller plot than its surrounding counterparts and would result in a cramped over-development of the site that would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the layout of the properties in the immediate area. On this basis, the proposal was considered to be contrary to the requirements of local and national planning policies.

In addition, it was considered that the proposed development would provide substandard living conditions for future occupiers. Namely:

- Substandard garden size/depth
- The outlook from the bedroom window would be directly onto the pavement.
- Overlooking from surrounding properties.

In summary the proposal fails to comply with paragraphs 17, 122, 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and the CS14, CS15 and CS19 of the Borough Council's Local Plan Policy.

In conclusion the officer recommended that the application be refused on the following two grounds - overdevelopment and unacceptable living conditions for future occupiers.

The application had been referred to the Committee by Cllr Lauren Sullivan.

The Committee heard the views of a public speaker in support of the application who answered questions from Members.

The following points were made during discussion on this application:

- It was noted that the dwelling was being proposed for use by a member of the speaker's family who needed somewhere to live. Following a question on whether one of the speaker's rental properties could be used instead, the Committee was advised that the speaker owned a number of properties one of which going through an eviction process. It was noted that this process had been delayed due to the pandemic and could not be finalised until after Christmas.
- The speaker confirmed that he had accessed pre-application advice from other local authorities which he had paid for and had not found the process to be useful. He confirmed that he had not accessed the Borough Council's pre-application advice service. The Principal Planner (Major Sites) confirmed that this service had been

- available throughout the pandemic and that the application had been determined as submitted and had been considered unacceptable.
- A number of Members including a few who had visited the site, expressed the opinion that the proposal did not have any redeeming features and that whilst the Borough needed additional housing to be built, that was not a good reason to approve an application that would be otherwise unacceptable.
 - Following a question, the officer confirmed that the bedroom window of the proposed property would look directly out onto the pavement and the wall of the dwelling directly abutted the pavement. Members were shown a photograph showing the context of the window to the street, the poor outlook and the cramped garden most of which was taken up by the parking space. Given the design, the officer confirmed that this combination of factors would be considered to create an overdevelopment of the site.
 - A question was raised on the difference between a flat and a family dwelling not having a garden. The officer explained that flats now had to be built with amenity space included on the development and family dwellings had to be built with included usable outside space.
 - Another member of the Committee commented on the comparison between an application for an infill one bedroom dwelling in Meopham that the Committee had recently considered and the much lower amenity in relation to this proposal.

Resolved that application 20210058 be refused Planning Permission on the following grounds:

1. The proposed dwelling will result in a prominent and cramped over-development of the site that would be incongruous with the character and appearance of the layout of the residential properties in the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policies CS14, CS15 and CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), and paragraphs 117, 122, 124, and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019); and
2. The proposed dwelling will result in an unacceptable and cramped amenity space for future occupiers, and would also be likely to experience unacceptable and mutual levels of overlooking and loss of privacy from the proposed layout and the close presence of Nos. 44-46 Rosebank Gardens. The proposal would therefore fail to provide a high standard of amenity for future occupiers and existing properties, which would conflict with the requirements of the SPG2 Residential Layout Guidelines (2020), Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and paragraph 127f of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Note: Mr Craig Edwards (Applicant)(a supporter) addressed the Committee.

43. Planning applications determined under delegated powers by the Director (Planning & Development)

A schedule showing applications determined by the Director (Planning & Development) under delegated powers had been published on the Council's website.

Close of meeting

The meeting ended at 7.22 pm

