

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0366.20

WARD : Harold Wood **Date Received:** 10th March 2020

ADDRESS: 8 SAXON CLOSE
ROMFORD

PROPOSAL: Proposed first floor side extension and alteration to existing approved roof

DRAWING NO(S): SC2
1828-8 rev Mar 20

RECOMMENDATION : It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the reason(s) given at the end of the report

SITE DESCRIPTION

Residential, two storey semi-detached dwelling finished in a mixture of painted render, face brick and wooden cladding. The application site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac within Saxon Close. Parking in the garage and on the drive to the front of the property. The surrounding area is characterised by two storey semi-detached dwellings.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a proposed first floor side extension and alteration to existing approved roof.

RELEVANT HISTORY

ES/HOR 467/60 'P' - New street & 18 houses - Approved.
ES/HOR 467/A/60 - 1 of 12 houses - Approved.
ES/HOR 467/C/60 - 1 of 12 houses - Approved.
L/HAV 594/70 - Living room extension - Approved.

P1753.18 - Proposal is to increase the height of sections of the rear boundary fence at the above property.
Apprv with cons 13-06-2019

P0556.18 - Demolition of existing single-storey extensions and detached garage and replacement with 2-storey side and rear extension with integral garage
Apprv with cons 12-06-2018

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours were consulted and one response was received raising the following concerns:

- The proposed addition is too close to the sideway, patio and garden.
- Proposal will block out light and be overbearing.
- Concerned there would be a greater loss of privacy due to the additional windows.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

DC33 - Car Parking

DC61 - Urban Design

SPD04 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 7.4 - Local character

LONDON PLAN - 7.6 - Architecture

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The application is not CIL liable.

STAFF COMMENTS

Due to the current Covid-19 crisis, the officer was unable to do a site visit. Site photos were sent in by the agent and were received by the officer on the 11th May. Aerial views and streetview were used also to assess the site and the proposal.

The applicant sought advice pre-application advice on the 28th February and concerns were raised regarding increasing the size of the footprint and that the proposal would not be subservient and it is likely that the application would be refused in the officer's opinion.

Works have commenced on site but are not substantially complete.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The works granted under as part of planning application P0556.18 is currently under construction and this application was for a two storey side and rear extension with integral garage.

This application under consideration is to extend the first floor side extension, however, the proposal would also extend beyond the rear wall of the dwelling.

In detailed terms, the proposed width of the ground and first floor side extensions would be approximately 133% and 116% of the original dwelling and when combined with both the gabled and hipped roofs (conflicting) of the two storey side extension due to the staggered design, the proposal lacks subservience and would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties, thereby causing harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Indeed, the roof area of the the proposed two storey side extension is larger than the existing dwelling.

Staff have taken in consideration developments which was dismissed on appeal at 2 Hesselyn Drive (Appeal reference APP/B5480/D/11/2148787 / P1530.10) which was refused on the width of the two storey side extension and also at 36 Sowrey Avenue (APP/B5480/A/11/2161359 / P0965.11), although this second appeal was in reference to a new dwelling, the appeal draws comparisons in relation to neighbouring two storey side extension and the impact of the proposal on the street scene.

In addition, parallels can be drawn with another appeal at 341 London Road, Romford (Appeal reference APP/B5480/D/10/2127004 / P0110.10) and finally, Staff have also taken in consideration a similar type of development which was dismissed on appeal at 36 Glenton Close, Romford (Appeal reference APP/B5480/D/12/2173724 / P1812.11) which was also refused on the the width of the two storey side extension.

The Planning Inspector on the latter appeal took the view that the proposal "would be too wide when compared to the width of the existing front elevation and would appear to be out of proportion to the original house. Similarly, the footprint of the extension and the extent and complexity of the proposed roof would not respect the scale of the host property or its simple design. The overall size and bulk of the extension would appear to dominate, rather than being subservient to, the host property and therefore would not integrate with it satisfactorily".

In addition, the Council guidelines as outlined in the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD states that "Roof extensions and alterations can change the appearance and character of the dwelling, particularly when alterations are made to the front elevation. There are concerns regarding the use of different roof forms. The cumulative impact of the previously approved application and this current one under consideration would unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair. It is considered the impact of conflicting roof form in conjunction with the scale of the existing and proposed two storey side extension would further exacerbate the impact of the proposal on the street scene and on the pair of semi-detached properties.

Furthermore, there are concerns regarding the excessive width of the first floor elevation when viewed from the rear which would equate to approximately 8.75m in width.

It is considered the scale and design of the proposal disrupts the balance of this pair of semi-detached houses and is visually out of keeping in the street scene, which is largely characterised by semi-detached development.

In relation to this submission, it is considered that the cumulative impact of the previously approved application and the additions proposed as part of this application would by reason of its excessive width, scale, bulk, mass, roof form and cramped appearance would unacceptably unbalance the appearance of this pair of semi-detached properties and thereby have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the local area.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the impact on the neighbouring dwelling in terms of loss of light and loss of privacy.

The proposed development would be located on the south west side of the dwelling. It is not envisaged that this part of the proposal would have any impact on the amenity of the attached neighbour at No.7 Saxon Close as they are located to the north east and the separation distance would mitigate any potential impact as the proposal would be located on the opposite side of the dwelling.

However of a greater concern, is the potential impact on the residents at No.9 Saxon Close, the proposal would lie at an oblique angle with this detached neighbour.

The proposal would bring the development closer to the boundary with No.9 Saxon Close.

It is considered that the proposed development would form a substantial wall of development which would be oppressive and provide an undue sense of enclosure to the neighbouring dwelling and rear garden and therefore result in an unneighbourly development.

The proposed development would, by reason of its depth, height, and position close to the boundaries of the site, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities and outlook of the adjacent occupiers at No.9 Saxon Close, Romford contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies

DPD and Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The development will meet parking requirements even though some space will be lost with the proposed development.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is considered to be contrary to the above-mentioned policies and guidance and a refusal is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the following reason(s):

1. Reason for refusal - Streetscene & Rear Garden

The proposed development would, by reason of its excessive width, scale, bulk, mass, conflicting roof form and cramped appearance would unacceptably unbalance the appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses and appear as a dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene and rear garden environment, harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and visual amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD, and Residential Extensions and Alterations SPDs and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

2. Reason for refusal - Residential Extensions

The proposed development would, by reason of its depth, height, and position close to the boundaries of the site, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities and outlook of the adjacent occupiers at No.9 Saxon Close, Romford contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

1 Refusal - No negotiation

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal and the reason(s) for it was given to Mr M Breden (Agent) by e-mail on 11/05/20.

Authorising Officer: Neil Goate	12-05-2020
--	------------