



Planning Committee

Wednesday, 23 November 2022

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S Walsh', written in a cursive style.

S Walsh
Service Manager (Communities)

List of documents attached

c) 20220839 - Cobham Lodge, Valley Drive, Gravesend

(Pages 3 - 6)

This page is intentionally left blank

SUMMARY REPORT

Application Ref:	20220839
Site Address:	Cobham Lodge, Valley Drive, Gravesend, Kent
Application Description:	Conversion of existing house to 10no. flats including side and rear extension and loft conversion. Conversion of rear annex building to 2no. dwelling houses including proposed new dormers. Construction of new apartment building to form 11no. new apartments. Construction of 8no. semi-detached and 1no. detached houses and associated development.
Applicant:	Dwight Breley Design Ltd
Agent:	Mr John Breley, Breley Design Ltd
Ward:	Singlewell
Parish:	Non-Parish Area
Decision due date:	8 December 2022
Publicity expiry date:	14 October 2022
Decision Level:	Planning Committee – Wednesday 23 November 2022
Reason for referral:	Member call-in and at the discretion of the Service Manager (Planning)
Recommendation:	Delegated to the Service Manager (Planning) to grant PERMISSION subject to planning conditions (including agreeing SUDS conditions with KCC) and the completion of a section 106 legal agreement

Summary of Reasons for Recommendation

This supplementary report provides a summary of the Member Site Inspection undertaken on 19 November 2022.

The recommendation to the Planning Committee remains as summarised below.

This is a major application for:

- Conversion of the existing house into 10no. flats including side and rear extension and loft conversion;
- Conversion of rear annex building to 2no. dwelling houses including proposed new dormers;
- Construction of new apartment building to form 11no. new apartments;
- Construction of 8no. semi-detached houses;
- Construction of 1no. detached house; and
- Associated development.

The proposed development is deemed to be a sustainable form of development that accords with national and local planning policy, apart from in relation to the delivery of affordable housing. The agent / applicant has confirmed they will provide all of the S.106 financial contributions which

meet the relevant tests set out within the NPPF (2021), however due to the viability of the scheme they are proposing to deliver a 100% market scheme with a viability review to assess actual costs and revenues, to determine whether or not they are able to deliver any sums to make the scheme policy compliant in affordable housing terms.

All representations received from both 3rd parties and consultees have been taken into account when considering this proposal and no amendments to the proposal are required.

Permission is recommended subject to the S.106 being signed and appropriate planning conditions being included.

1. Member Site Inspection

1.1 The site inspection took place on Saturday 19th November 2022 at 11am

Present:

Members

Cllr Sangha (Chairman)

Cllr Craske (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Rice

Cllr Lane

Cllr Francis

Cllr Hills (Substitute for Cllr Jassal)

Cllr Hoskins (Substitute for Cllr Harding)

Cllr Morton (Ward Cllr)

Apologies:

Cllr Morley

Officers of the Council:

Richard Hart (Team Leader)

Amanda Grout (Senior Planner)

For the Applicant:

Ravi Shetra

Manjit Singh

1.2 The Chair of the Committee, Cllr Brian Sangha welcomed all to the inspection and reminded Members that the purpose of the Site Inspection was an opportunity to inspect the site and surroundings and to visualise the development proposals in the local context. Members were reminded that they were encouraged to ask questions about the proposed development, but that they should not express opinions about the proposals.

1.3 The chair asked Mrs Grout to explain the proposals. Mrs Grout set out the proposed development and explained in detail each of the elements of the proposals. Members were informed that the scheme consisted of 4 elements; extension and conversion of the existing dwelling to 10no. apartments, extension and conversion of the existing

outbuilding at the rear of the Garden into two dwellings, erection of a block of flats consisting of 11no. apartments and a row of 8no. semi-detached and 1no. detached dwelling along the southern boundary of the site.

- 1.4 In regard to the annex conversion Mrs Grout explained to Members there would be no windows in the south elevation at first floor facing Sheldon Heights and the proposed dormers would be fronting east/west.
- 1.5 Mrs Grout outlined that within the development there would be two pocket parks providing amenity space for future occupiers.
- 1.6 Mr Hart added that Members should note that part of the existing outbuilding and the garden to the rear of it is within the Green Belt.
- 1.7 Cllr Lane asked for clarification on the relevance of the rear portion of the site being in the Green Belt. Mrs Grout confirmed that the impact on Green Belt is covered within section 4 of the committee report. For clarification Mr Hart confirmed that taking into account relevant case law the rear portion of the site is considered to be previously developed land.
- 1.8 Cllr Lane clarified that Members would be considering if there is any additional harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
- 1.9 Cllr Sangha asked for clarification in regard to trees on site. Mrs Grout confirmed that the application seeks to retain trees on the boundaries and where existing trees have died these would be replaced through a planning condition addressing soft landscaping.
- 1.10 Mr Hart confirmed that a number of trees within the vicinity are protected by a Tree protection Order which dates back to the late 1980s and for the avoidance doubt this includes the tree to the front.
- 1.11 Cllr Hoskins noted that the tree to front of the site did not look healthy.
- 1.12 Cllr Sangha asked for a plan of the TPO to be presented at Committee, as part of the presentation.
- 1.13 Cllr Sangha asked about the amount of comments received and Mr Hart confirmed that regardless of where or how many comments have been received only material planning considerations are taken into account and the report fully addresses this in paragraph 3.1 (Publicity).
- 1.14 A number of Members asked what engagement has been undertaken with surrounding properties. Mrs Grout explained that along with Mr Hart they had visited a number of surrounding properties.
- 1.15 Cllr Rice and Cllr Lane asked for clarification on the distance from Sheldon Heights to the rear elevation of the proposed dwellings. Mrs Grout confirmed the distance of 8.5m and this was taken from boundary and not any retaining walls on site. Mrs Grout also set-out and confirmed the first floor windows of the properties of Sheldon Heights are a mixture of habitable and non-habitable rooms and whilst they do afford views of the site, these are obscured due to the existing boundary trees. The properties of Sheldon Heights sit at a higher ground level and therefore the windows in the rear elevations of the proposed dwellings would sit lower and would not directly overlook existing windows and the distances between the rear elevations have been laid out in

Paragraphs 4.91-4.92 of the committee report. In terms of overshadowing, the orientation of the site and proposed development is such that overshadowing would be localised within the site and not over habitable room windows of adjacent properties. Mrs Grout also confirmed that the properties of the proposed developments have been designed with front elevations/entrances facing into the site.

- 1.16 Cllr Sangha asked about the proximity of Lower Thames Crossing to the application site. Mr Hart confirmed that it would be to the east and includes part of Claylane Woods.
- 1.17 Members were then shown the proposed site layout and Mrs Grout ran through the proposed layout and explained in detail the different elements/design of each part of the scheme.
- 1.18 Mrs Grout explained that the highways layout for the proposal was acceptable and all parking spaces for the apartments are unallocated and all visibility splays are acceptable.
- 1.19 Cllr Rice asked if the footpath into the site is a Public Rights of Way. Mrs Grout advised that the pedestrian access to the site was not a Public Rights of Way.
- 1.20 Cllr Sangha thanked all the attendance and closed the meeting.