

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0966.22

WARD : Mawneys

Date Received: 15th June 2022

ADDRESS: 50 Lawns Way
Romford

PROPOSAL: Proposed front dormer roof extension.

DRAWING NO(S): 1.04-4
1.03-4
2.02-4
2.03-4
1.02-4
2.01-1

RECOMMENDATION : It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site features a semi-detached bungalow. It benefits from a loft conversion to include a rear dormer and hip to gable roof conversion. It is not a listed building or within a conservation area.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the addition of one front dormer.

1. The proposed dormer would measure approximately 2.18m wide, 1.78m high and 2.87m deep.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P1975.21 - Proposed front dormer roof extension.
Refuse 17-05-2022

P1004.21 - Single storey rear extension and amendments of fenestration to front and side elevations
Apprv with cons 19-07-2021

D0163.21 - Certificate of lawfulness for a loft conversion to include a rear dormer, the conversion of roof from hip to gable end and one front roof light as well as alterations to roof over existing rear extension
PP not required 06-05-2021

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent out to four neighbours regarding the proposals. No objections were received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

* For ease of reference, Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD will be referred to as 'SPD'.

LONDON PLAN (adopted 2021):

- Policy D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth
- Policy D4 - Delivering good design
- Policy T6 - Car parking

Havering Council Local Plan (2016-31):

- Policy 7 (Residential design and amenity)
- Policy 24 (Parking provision and design)
- Policy 26 (Urban Design)

LDF

SPD04 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

OTHER

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

This application is not CIL liable because the newly created floorspace would be less than 100 square metres.

STAFF COMMENTS

In accordance with the current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken. Site photos provided by the agent of the application site, Google Street View, aerial view images and submitted drawings were used to assess the site's constraints.

This application is a resubmission of a previously refused planning application P1975.21. The key issue in this case therefore is whether the revised proposal overcomes the previously stated concerns. The previous application was refused planning permission for the following reason:

1. The proposed front dormer would, by reason of its scale, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Local Plan Policy 7 and the Residential Extensions Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

This application differs from the previously refused scheme in the following key areas:

1. The proposed dormer would measure approximately 2.20m wide instead of 3.94m.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The 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. Extensions to a dwelling should ensure that they do not unbalance the symmetry of a pair of semi-detached properties.

It also states that dormers should be contained well within the body of the roof, by being set well back from the eaves, set lower than the ridge, and by setting the sides well in from any gables or party walls and that pitched roofs set at right angles to the main roof are preferred. Dormers that front the highway should not exceed 1.2m width. Furthermore, where a larger window area is required on an elevation facing the highway, two smaller dormers with pitched roofs should be provided, suitably spaced apart, to minimise the apparent bulk of the additions.

The guidance is reinforced by policy 7 (residential design and amenity) of the local plan, which seeks to ensure any development would be of an acceptable design.

Although situated very close to the ridge of the roof, in comparison to the front dormer which was proposed under P1975.21, the dormer proposed under this application is of a reduced bulk, scale and mass. The character of the immediate surrounding area is also relatively mixed, with a number of properties including nos. 10, 13 and 16 The Drive as well as nos. 71 and 73 Lawns Way benefitting from flat roofed front dormers and 61 and 63 Lawns Way benefitting from pitched roof front dormers. Given this varied character and the fact that no. 71 Lawns Way were granted planning consent for a similarly 2.20m wide front dormer in 2019 (application reference: P0297.19), the proposal is not considered to appear exceptionally out of keeping or visually intrusive. Although policy set out in the SPD specifies that the roof of front dormers should be pitched, staff have no objections to a flat roof dormer from a visual standpoint because it is considered that the roof style would be in-keeping with the character of flat roofed dormers within the surrounding area.

For the reasons set out above, therefore, the proposed front dormer is on balance judged to be acceptable and overcome the reason for refusal of P1975.21.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The proposal would introduce an additional front facing windows within the proposed dormers, which would face the highway and not likely result in any amenity impacts to neighbours.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

No highway or parking issues would arise as a result of the proposals.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

It is considered that the proposed development is acceptable. It is judged to not adversely affect the character of the property or the visual amenities of the street scene. It would also not cause a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities enjoyed by neighbouring properties and is also considered to overcome the reason for refusal of the planning application P1975.21.

It is therefore recommended that planning permission is GRANTED.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out as approved.

3. SC10 (Matching materials)

All new external finishes shall be carried out in materials to match those of the existing building(s) to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area.

INFORMATIVES

1 Approval - No negotiation required

Statement Required by Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Authorising Officer: Neil Goate
--

12-08-2022
