

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P1699.20

WARD : Rainham & Wennington

Date Received: 16th November 2020

ADDRESS: 19 LAKE AVENUE
RAINHAM

PROPOSAL: Retention of elevational changes to include front porch hip roof, bay windows, enlargement of rear dormer, rear garden outbuilding for gym purpose including bathroom, front boundary wall and the relocation of Vehicular Crossover

DRAWING NO(S): 01; 02; 03; 04; 05; 06; 07; 08b; 09c; 10b.

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

SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposed site is a detached bungalow located on the corner of Lake Avenue and Stoke Road. The surrounding area is characterised by residential bungalows, semi-detached and terrace properties.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the retention of the following:

- Elevation changes to the front elevation of the dwelling, namely the front porch gable roof, alterations to bay windows and front dormer windows; enlargement of the rear dormer and rear garden outbuilding for gym purpose including bathroom.

- Retention of front boundary wall and the relocation of Vehicular Crossover

RELEVANT HISTORY

P0892.20 - Retention of front boundary wall and the relocation of Vehicular Crossover
Refuse 27-08-2020

P0889.20 - Retention of elevational changes to include front porch hip roof, bay windows, and enlargement of rear dormer. Retention of rear garden outbuilding for gym purpose including bathroom
Refuse 27-08-2020

P0691.19 - Single storey side and rear extensions. Loft conversion to include rear dormer, 2 no. dormers to front, windows to sides and roof alterations to include an increase in roof space and height . Front porch/extension involving demolition of attached garage.
Apprv with cons 29-07-2019

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbouring occupiers were consulted through direct notification, no letters of representation have been received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

DC32 - The Road Network

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

This application arises from Enforcement investigations with ref: ENF/364/20 and seeks retrospective planning permission. It is also a resubmission of two previously refused applications with refs: P0892.20 and P0889.20; which were refused for the following reasons:

Ref: P0892.20.

1. The development in the form of the front boundary wall and railings to be retained, would by reason of its design, height and position close to the property boundary form an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature, harmful to the appearance of the street scene and detracting from the open character of the surrounding area, contrary to the London Borough of Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and Policy DC61 of London Borough of Havering LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Plan Document 2008.

Ref: P0889.20:

1. The proposed front alterations (box-like bay window feature and dominant pitch roof front porch) by reason of their design, bulk and scale would unacceptably compromise the architectural composition/feature of the building and would appear dominant, incongruous and visually intrusive in the street scene contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

2. The proposed enlarged rear dormer window, by reason of its bulk, massing and proximity to the eaves would occupy an unacceptably large area of the rear roof slope, forming a dominant and visually intrusive feature, detrimental to the character and appearance of the property and materially harmful to the visual amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

3. The proposed outbuilding would, by reason of its width, height, scale, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden environment and streetscene (Stoke Road), harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

The current scheme is a composite repeat application for the previously refused applications.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

DC61 states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area. Further stating that the development must respond to distinctive local building forms and patterns of development.

Front alterations:

The front elevational changes are considered not to be an improvement to the host dwelling. The design of the bay windows features a box-like design which is not sympathetic to the dwelling or the surrounding area. In terms of the front porch extension, it is of note that there are very few front porches on neighbouring properties with no uniform pattern for development, however, the proposed front porch appears too bulky and does not relate well with the host property. The combination of the bay windows and front porch are considered incongruous additions to the host dwelling and harmful to the visual amenity of surrounding area.

Rear dormer:

The proposed rear dormer measures 3.15m in depth, 9.2m in width and 2.2m in height compared to the previously approved scheme with 2.31m depth, 9m in width and 1.6m in height. Whilst the as-built is smaller in scale (as seen on photos), the proposed is a significant increase and does not comply with policy guidance. In this respect, officer consider that the proposed rear dormer window would be an incongruous form of development, given that the height, width and general massing is excessive and beyond that generally permissible within guidelines. No immediately adjoining neighbours have undertaken a similar sized rear development and therefore there is no precedent for allowing the proposal. Under the previously approved scheme, the rear dormer was allowed following amendments due to concerns raised regarding the scale/bulk and in comparison with the adjacent property at No. 17 Lake Avenue. As such, the rear dormer is also unacceptable.

Outbuilding:

The proposed outbuilding would be 11.50m wide with a varying depth of 4.3m and 4.9m and a flat roof at a maximum height of 2.95m. Bi-folding doors are proposed within the front facade of the outbuilding.

Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD states that "The outbuilding should be subordinate in scale to the existing dwelling and to the plot. In assessing proposals, the Council will consider factors such as the scale, height, proximity to boundaries, roof design, finishing materials and prominence in the street scene or rear garden environment. As with all extensions, outbuildings should not detract from the character of the area and should be unobtrusively located to the side and rear of the existing dwelling."

Given the considerable footprint of the outbuilding, especially when compared with the footprint of the dwelling and other smaller outbuildings in the vicinity, it is considered that the outbuilding has not been designed to appear subordinate to the main dwelling and would appear intrusive and out of scale within its surroundings. The proposed outbuilding would be substantial, and distinctly noticeable in the proposed location; particularly given the open spatial character of the area, and the modest development in neighbouring gardens. Whilst it is noted that there is a garage on the shared boundary, it is smaller in scale. The size and scale of the outbuilding is completely dissimilar to any other outbuildings on similar neighbouring properties. It is therefore considered to be excessive and contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD as well as Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. The proposal should therefore be refused.

Boundary Treatment:

The iron railings and wall would be widely visible from the public highway and consideration must be given to the impact of the development upon the character and quality of the street scene.

Site inspection reveals that the majority of dwellings in the area have modest height boundary treatments or none which form an intrinsic part of the distinctive character of the surrounding area.

In considering this application, the Local Planning Authority have considered two recent appeal decisions at No.134 Belgrave Avenue, Romford under appeal reference APP/B5480/D/18/3202234 / P0254.18 and APP/B5480/D/19/3223423 / P1551.18 but also a further one at 245A Mawney Road, Romford under appeal reference APP/B5480/D/18/3215050 / P1119.18.

On the first appeal above, the Planning Inspector stated on this appeal that " the new railings are complex and decorative, above sculpted brick walls on the side boundaries, but they introduce an obtrusive feature into the streetscene which diminishes the relatively open character of the surroundings and creates an uncharacteristic element. The railings and gate are not sympathetic to their setting and they erode the qualities of the surrounding area. Moreover, if this form of development were to be more widely repeated, it would have a pronounced and undesirable cumulative effect on the surroundings".

It is considered that the railings and walls to be retained to be visually intrusive, forming an unacceptably dominant feature in the street scene. The proposed railings are considered to impact unacceptably on the character of the area, where the majority of neighbouring properties maintain low front facing boundary walls or an open frontage to allow for parking of motor vehicles on hard standing to the front of the property. Also, the materials by way of the color used does not complement the existing boundary treatment to the side and appears visually jarring and significantly detracts from the streetscene.

The agent has provided two examples at Nos. 37 and 59 Lake Avenue. The examples provided have high boundary treatments along the front boundary, however, the Council have no records of consent being given for these front boundary treatment and the matter was referred to Planning Enforcement to investigate.

Officers conclude that the introduction of the boundary wall and gates would be at odds with the established height of the front boundary walls in this area. Consequently the proposed development would appear as an out of character development and would unacceptably impact on the character and setting of the site and its surrounding environment. In this instance the proposal is not policy compliant.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The proposed changes to the front would not result in undue harm to the neighbouring dwelling at no. 17 Lake Avenue

The proposed outbuilding is well removed from the living accommodation of neighbouring occupiers. The height of the outbuilding is considered high for this type of building, however overshadowing or other loss of light to neighbouring garden areas will be modest. Concerns may arise should the outbuilding be used for residential or commercial purposes in future, however such a condition may be sufficient to limit any such use.

No objections are therefore raised to the development from the loss of amenity point of view.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

Policy DC32 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document is relevant in this instance as is policy DC33. With regard to this, officers note that the

dwelling has space for the parking of a minimum to the front of the property. This provision would be unaffected by the development and accordingly no objection is raised in respect of policy DC33.

The Highway Authority have not provided comments for this application and the issue of the dropped kerb relates to a different legislation.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The development is considered unacceptable and fails council policy and guidance and the proposal is recommended for REFUSAL.

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. Reason for refusal - Residential Extensions

The proposed front alterations (box-like bay window feature and dominant pitch roof front porch) by reason of their design, bulk and scale would unacceptably compromise the architectural composition/feature of the building and would appear dominant, incongruous and visually intrusive in the street scene contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

2. Reason for refusal - Dormers

The proposed enlarged rear dormer window, by reason of its bulk, massing and proximity to the eaves would occupy an unacceptably large area of the rear roof slope, forming a dominant and visually intrusive feature, detrimental to the character and appearance of the property and materially harmful to the visual amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

3. Reason for refusal - Streetscene

The proposed outbuilding would, by reason of its width, height, scale, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden environment and streetscene (Stoke Road), harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

4. Refusal for refusal - Boundary Treatment

The development in the form of the front boundary wall and railings to be retained, would by reason of its design, height and position close to the property boundary form an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature, harmful to the appearance of the street scene and detracting from the open character of the surrounding area, contrary to the London Borough of Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and Policy DC61 of London Borough of Havering LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Plan Document 2008.

1 Refusal - No negotiation ENTER DETAILS

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, it was necessary to issue a decision as close to the statutory timeframe as possible as opposed to seeking amendments which would have significantly delayed the application.

Authorising Officer: Gary Rice

16-02-2021