

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P1987.22

WARD: Marshalls & Rise Pk **Date Received:** 6th December 2022

ADDRESS: 92 Pettits Lane
Romford

PROPOSAL: Part single part two storey side extension with removal of chimney stack, loft extension with roof lights, removal of both rear conservatories and erection of one sun room, changes to fenestration/door to front elevation and other side elevation

DRAWING NO(S): 02
03
04
04 Rev D (proposed)
02 Rev D (proposed)
01 Rev D
03 Rev D (proposed)
05

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

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to a two storey detached dwelling located on Pettits Lane. The dwelling is finished in red brick and plain tiles. There is car parking spaces on the front forecourt which can accommodate two vehicles.

The application site is located with a predominantly residential area and is not within a conservation area. Nor is it a Listed building.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Consent is sought for a part single part two storey side extension with removal of chimney stack, loft extension with roof lights, removal of both rear conservatories and erection of one sun room, changes to fenestration/door to front elevation and other side elevation. It is observed also that there would be a partial change of use of the garage, however the external appearance would remain as is.

The dwelling was the subject of an application in 2019 which comprised of part single/part double

storey side extension, single storey rear extension under reference P0623.19. It is not clear whether this has been implemented, evidence before officers would indicate not as no building control submission exists. It is however a material consideration as it remains capable of being implemented.

OFFICER COMMENT: It was observed that the drawings as submitted had a discrepancy which showed the existing elevations incorrectly. It is not considered that this was prejudicial to any residents in making comments as the proposed elevations showed clearly the proposals. Corrected plans were received 01-03-2023.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P0364.21	Loft extension involving conversion of roof from hip to gable end, to include a side dormer and roof terrace and part single, part two storey side extension involving part conversion of attached garage to habitable use and external alterations including changes to windows
	Refuse 05-05-2021
P0623.19	Part single/part double storey side extension, single storey rear extension.
	Apprv with cons 24-12-2020

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Adjoining occupiers were invited to comment through direct notification, one letter of representation was received.

The comments made are not material in planning terms and refer to civil matters/building regulations compliance requirements.

RELEVANT POLICIES

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The are no contributions required under CIL regulations, owing to the limited new floor area created.

STAFF COMMENTS

There is no preclusion against extensions such as that sought, subject to compliance with Council design criteria and other policy considerations.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The Framework states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. It goes on to set out that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, in so far as that it creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. However an overarching consideration is the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), of promoting regeneration and change; and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places. The framework requires that permission is refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

In this respect, the surrounding environment is composed of a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying style and design. There are variations in overall height but generally a consistency in terms of scale and massing, with traditional suburban back-to-back gardens. Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 is also applicable and relates to residential design and the urban environment.

Whilst extensions and alterations can bring many benefits to the householder in terms of extra space and security, they can also undermine the original character of both the property they are associated with and the street they are situated within. It is important that extensions and alterations do not dominate or detract from the character of the original house and the surrounding houses, or unacceptably reduce the amenity of neighbouring properties. To assist with determining the acceptability of extensions to residential dwellings the Council adopted the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD in 2011. This document offers detailed design guidance and principles.

Turning firstly to the conversion of the garage, there would be no outward signs of the internal space having been reduced, with plans submitted indicating that the existing door would be retained. Consequently there are no objections held to the visual implications of this element as there would be none. The bay feature to the front is shown to be adjusted slightly, it is not considered that this would adversely impact the street-scene and would have limited visual impacts. The projection to the side and rear at single storey level would be compliant generally with Council design guidance and would have no street-scene implications in any case.

The primary consideration comes in the form of the roof which would remove the dual pitched feature and replace it with a larger crown roof. Such a design feature is not present within the locality of the scale shown and would be uncharacteristic. Given that it would be highly prominent and visible from the street rather than concealed it would exacerbate the visual impacts of the development on the whole with the appearance in the street wholly removed from the existing. Officers consider that the provision of a crown roof in the style shown would detract from the characterful appearance of the dwelling at present.

With regards to the provision of a first floor side extension officers previously had taken issue with the lateral separation being reduced. The Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD states that houses should not be extended up to side boundaries since this would involve closing the characteristic spacing between dwellings. It requires that the space between buildings at first floor level is maintained. Officers accept that permission was granted under ref: P0623.19 for a two storey side extension which remains capable of being implemented, however that scheme did not include the provision of a crown roof feature/resultant massing. Officers consider that the lateral separation between dwellings, whilst not uniform by any means, represents a positive characteristic of the street-scene and that in closing down the space present from the shared boundary in

conjunction with the increased massing at roof level that there would be harm to the street-scene, local character and subject dwelling more generally as outlined.

Taking the development cumulatively, the resultant dwelling would have an overwhelming presence in the street-scene at odds with Council guidance and harmful to surrounding character. Through its resultant scale and massing and the lack of subservience in the additions shown, the resultant building would form a dominant and intrusive feature with little in common with the surrounding environment, which whilst varied in character appears to have a general consistency in terms of massing. The provision of a crown roof of the scale shown is symptomatic of an overdevelopment and one which would be present in the street-scene. The overall visual impression from the street would be materially changed the character of the existing property would be harmed.

The sum of all additions would fail to exhibit subservience and would be harmful to local character through setting a harmful precedent. In summary the proposals are symptomatic of an overdevelopment contrary to Havering Local Plan Policy 26, the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and London Plan 2021 Policy D4.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (HLP) states that planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/ daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy, noise, vibration and disturbance to existing and future residents. This policy is to be read in conjunction with Policy 26 however the objectives are reflected in Policy 34 also which states that development will not be permitted where it would unduly impact upon amenity, human health and safety and the natural environment by noise, dust, odour and light pollution, vibration and land contamination.

With regards to the provision of a first floor side extension, the impacts would be within acceptable tolerances with regards to light and outlook. The visual implications of this part of the development and the rest of the alterations are considered in the preceding section of this report. Alterations to openings shown on elevations could be controlled through planning condition. The amenity impacts of the roof alterations are limited to adjoining sites. To that end, whilst there would be greater bulk at roof level it is not considered that this would translate to material harm in terms of loss of light, overshadowing or sense of overbearing. The rear projection as shown would comply with Council guidance and as such would not present any amenity concerns.

Notwithstanding other areas where the scheme is considered to fail, the development is not considered to impact neighbouring amenity unacceptably.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

Whilst the proposals would result in the loss of the integral garage for the purpose of providing vehicle parking, adequate space would be retained to the site frontage so as not to impede existing parking provision unacceptably. This is consistent with earlier decision making.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

Having regard to the above and in doing so all relevant planning policy and material considerations REFUSAL is recommended accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1 Refusal non standard

Taking the development cumulatively, the resultant dwelling would have an overwhelming presence in the street-scene at odds with Council guidance and harmful to surrounding character. Through its resultant scale and massing arising from the uncharacteristic crown roof feature and side extension, the resultant building would form a dominant and intrusive feature with little in common with the surrounding environment. The proposals would be harmful to local character through setting a harmful precedent. In summary the proposals are symptomatic of an overdevelopment contrary to Havering Local Plan Policy 26, the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and London Plan 2021 Policy D4. There would also be conflict with Para 130 of the Framework which requires development add to the overall quality of the area.

INFORMATIVES

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 the agent in writing 01-03-2023

Authorising Officer:



Habib Neshat

2nd March 2023