

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P2284.21

WARD : Mawneys

Date Received: 1st December 2021

ADDRESS: 61 RAMSDEN DRIVE
ROMFORD

PROPOSAL: Part two storey side/rear extension involving alterations to main roof, single storey rear extension and loft conversion/roof extension.

DRAWING NO(S): Site Location Plan; Block Plan
PL-002
PL--003
PL-004
PL-005
PL-006RevB
PL-007RevC
PL-008RevB

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

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site features a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on Ramsden Drive. The application site is located with a predominantly residential area and is not within a Conservation area. Nor is it a Listed building.

Note:

In accordance with the current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken. Site photos were provided by the agent in support of the application. In determining this planning application photos, Google StreetView TM, aerial view images and submitted drawings were used to assess the site constraints.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The scheme proposes a two storey side extension, part two storey and single storey rear extension and a loft conversion involving a rear dormer.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P1694.21 - Part two storey side/rear extension involving alterations to main roof, single storey rear extension and loft conversion/roof extension.
Refuse 26-10-2021

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

The council received no response to the proposal during the consultation period.

RELEVANT POLICIES

NPPF (2021)

London Plan (2021)

Policy D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth
Policy D3 - Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach.
Policy D4 - Delivering good design
Policy T6 - Car parking

Havering Local Plan (2016 - 2031)
Policy 7 Residential design and amenity
Policy 24 Parking provision and design
Policy 26 Urban design

LDF

SPD04 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed extensions fall just under 100 square metres in floor area so therefore the application is not CIL liable.

STAFF COMMENTS

By way of background this is a resubmission of a previously refused application ref: P1694.21 and was refused for the following reason:

1.The proposed development by virtue of its bulky and unsightly roof form, together with out of proportion scale and mass of the proposed extensions would not appear as subservience to the existing dwelling. Consequently the proposal would appear incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene and rear garden environment, harmful to the appearance and character of the subject dwelling and surrounding area, contrary to policy DC61 of the London Borough of Havering LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD 2008, and the London Borough of Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2011.

Following this, pre-application was sought through the duty planner service ref: ENQ-0999196.

Extract from duty planner:

The previous application was refused mainly on design in terms of the visual impact of the roof form, scale and mass of the extension not appearing subservient.

The drawings submitted for duty planner has not overcome the concerns under the previous application due to the full width of the rear dormer across the full length of the existing main roof and the proposed side extension. The bulk of the whole extension still gives an appearance of a three storey building and the pitched roof form over the two storey rear extension is also not policy compliant.

It is noted that No. 25 Ramsden Drive have developed a combined side extension and loft conversion under planning ref: P0028.16. However, it should be noted that the rear dormer is contained well within the roof and the overall width of the building (including the side extension) is 7.11m. Therefore, the rear dormer proposed with an overall width of 8.3m is considered not to be comparable in scale and bulk. I suggest you review the submitted plans for No. 25 Ramsden Drive on our website www.havering.gov.uk/planning as well as the Councils residential extensions and alterations which I have attached for your convenience - please refer to section 5, 6 and 8.

In terms of gabling the roof, again no. 25 Ramsden Drive obtained approval in 2015 for the two storey side extension with a gabled roof form. The justification is because it is far enough away from both the end of the terrace and the non-attached terrace to not appear incongruous in the

street. The proposal to gable the roof is a judgement call on whether this would be acceptable due to the proximity of the roof of No.59 Ramsden Drive and the application site. The overall characteristics of the within the streetscene are hipped. I suggest you provide a contextual elevation of the streetscene to show the relationship.

Overall, the revised scheme would likely receive a refusal again unless the scheme is revised in accordance with standard policy and guidelines. Please note that if you wish to proceed to application stage, the overall design would be assessed against the emerging Local Plan policies; Policy 7 and 26, which is likely to be adopted this month. Therefore what may be considered acceptable under outdated policy may not be acceptable now.

In summary, for the proposal to receive officers support, the following would need to be addressed:

~ Rear dormer should be contained well within the roof form

~ Hipped roof over two storey rear extension

~ Gabled roof form over two storey side extension is a judgement call.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Rear Extensions:

The dimensions of the single storey rear (3.22m deep) and first floor rear (2.22m deep) extensions are within the guidelines of the SPD. However, there is further guidance given that "For all two storey rear extensions, the roof should be pitched, set at right angles to the main roof and generally finished with a hipped end". As it is currently proposed, the applicant seeks to finish the roofline of the two storey rear extension with a hipped crown roof rather than a hipped roofline. This element adds to the overall bulk of the development and is therefore considered unacceptable.

The proposal includes two storey side extension with a gable roof and a large box style rear dormer. It is noted within the streetscene that the characteristic gap between dwellings have been eroded as a result of the side extensions built on the boundary to terrace and semi-detached dwellings. In this context and considering the adjacent property (No. 59 Ramsden Drive) have built up to the boundary with no setback at first floor level as a result of been an end of terrace property, the principle of a side extension is considered acceptable. However, the roof of the existing building will be joined to the proposed side extension and be finished with a gabled roof. The overall characteristic within the streetscene is of hipped roofs, therefore the roof form would be a visually intrusive feature of an incongruous design, which does not respect the harmony of the group of dwellings.

Whilst there has been some improvement to the scheme in terms of the rear dormer pulled in from the sides, (although as seen from the side elevation and section, it appears to be flush with the flank walls) the scheme still as the appearance of a three storey building and dominant. Officer do not anticipate the finished works will appear sympathetic to the original house. Consequently, officers conclude that the combined development would appear as out of character and incongruous addition in this local context and would adversely impact on the character and appearance of the host property, garden scene and the wider area.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the two adjoining neighbours at nos. 63 and 59 Ramsden Drive.

59 Ramsden Drive (unattached neighbour):

This neighbour has developed a two side and rear extensions up to the boundary. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be mitigated by the neighbouring extensions. Therefore a

reasonable level of amenity would be afforded.

63 Ramsden Drive (attached neighbour)

The two storey side extension would be located on the south side of the dwelling. It is not envisaged that these parts of the proposal would have any impact on the amenity of the attached neighbour as they are located to the north and the separation distance would mitigate any potential impact, as the proposal would be located on the opposite side of the dwelling.

The proposed single storey rear extension would not likely impact on the neighbours amenity as it would be in accordance with the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and would not project further than the attached neighbours existing rear extension. Likewise the first floor rear extension is setback from the boundary by more 3m and therefore a reasonable level of amenity will be afforded this neighbour.

It is considered that the loft conversion window would not result in any undue overlooking or loss of privacy above and above existing conditions, particularly as there are first floor windows of neighbouring properties already overlook the rear garden areas of surrounding residential properties.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

No highway or parking issues would arise as a result of the proposal as the existing side garage remains and there is sufficient space for car parking onsite.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposed development is still contrary to planning policy and guidance and therefore it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. Reason for refusal - Residential Extensions

The proposed development by virtue of its roof form, together with out of proportion scale and mass of the proposed extensions would not appear as subservience to the existing dwelling. Consequently the proposal would appear incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene and rear garden environment, harmful to the appearance and character of the subject dwelling and surrounding area, contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, policies D1, D3 and D4 of The London Plan (2021) and Policies 7 and 26 of the Local Plan.

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: Simon Thelwell

Simon Thelwell

26-01-2022

