

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0804.23

WARD: Emerson Park **Date Received:** 22nd May 2023

ADDRESS: 1 Suffolk Way
Hornchurch

PROPOSAL: Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory, conversion of loft with rear dormer and roof lights to front, and extension of front porch roof

DRAWING NO(S): 01 Rev 1
02 Rev 1
03 Rev 1
04 Rev 1
05 Rev 1
06 Rev 1
07 Rev 1
08 Rev 1
09 Rev 1
12 Rev 1

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 houses a semi-detached residential 2-storey dwelling house. The property is not listed, nor is it within a conservation area. No trees will be affected as a result of this proposal. The surrounding area is residential in nature, containing mainly detached houses. There are various extensions in close proximity.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The applicant is seeking planning consent for a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory, conversion of loft with rear dormer and roof lights to front, and extension of front porch roof.

RELEVANT HISTORY

ES/HOR/1662(D)/55 - 182 Houses

L/HAV/1522/72 - Conservatory

L/HAV1138/76 - Single storey side extension

L/HAV1771/84 - Sloping tiled roof over existing flat roofed ground floor projection

P1080.87 - First floor side extension

D0241.23 Certificate of Lawfulness for a loft conversion with rear dormer and roof lights to front. Single storey rear extension and erection of outbuilding to rear for use as office/storage
Awaiting Decision

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Letters were sent to the immediate neighbouring properties. One objection has been received from a local Councillor with concerns that there are already issues with parking congestion in the area. This will be considered later in this report.

RELEVANT POLICIES

Havering Local Plan Adopted November 2021

- Policy 7 Residential Design and Amenity
- Policy 24 Parking provision and design
- Policy 26 Urban Design

Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document Adopted 2011 (SPD)

- Section 5 Rear extensions
- Section 6 Side extensions
- Section 7 Front and porch extensions
- Section 8 Roof extensions, loft conversions and dormer windows

Referred to throughout the report as REA SPD

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

Not CIL liable.

STAFF COMMENTS

An in-person site visit was not undertaken. In determining this planning application, photos, Google street view, aerial view images and submitted drawings were used to assess the site constraints.

At this time, Officer's sought some initial revisions on the plans to reduce the size and width of the rear dormer which were duly revised and submitted by the agent. Upon further review of the plans, it was deemed the proposal still did not align with current planning policy. Consideration was given to seeking further amendments, but given the significant conflict with adopted planning policy and the fact Pre-Application advice was not sought Officer's intend to issue a notice of refusal.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

FRONT PORCH ROOF EXTENSION:

The extension of the small roof across the extension would not look bulky or prominent in the street scene.

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION:

The height of the single storey rear extension would be 3.1m with a pitched roof and the depth would be 3m, meeting guidance in the SPD. It would relate acceptably in terms of design, bulk and mass to the original dwelling.

TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION:

The subject dwelling already benefits from an existing side extension which was built to the first floor level under P1080.87. The proposal would see the extension widened and the height increased. As the side extension is highly prominent in the street scene the proposal would have to clearly demonstrate it would not harm the character of the area.

Section 6.6 of the REA SPD states that "two-storey side extensions on semi-detached houses should be set back at least one metre from the front wall of the dwelling at first floor level, to create a break in the roofline and facade". The side extension would be set back the required 1m and does create the required break and also retains the minimum 1m inset from the side boundary for a dwelling on a corner.

Of greater concern is the requirement for double storey side extensions to semi-detached dwellings be subordinate in comparison to the host dwelling. The proposed side extension is only set down from the main ridge line of the roof of the existing dwelling by 0.1m. Additionally, the eaves of the side extension are set higher than the eaves of the existing dwelling. The high eave height to the extension is not seen in any other semi-detached pair in the immediate area.

As such, Officer's do not consider the extension would maintain the required subservience to the host dwelling and instead would appear as an incongruous element in comparison to similar side extensions in the immediate area. Given the proposed scheme would widen the side extension the impact on the character is further increased. It is the opinion of Officer's that the existing side extension better reflects the requirements of planning policy and represents a better design outcome than the proposed scheme.

REAR AND FRONT DORMER AND LOFT CONVERSION:

Section 8 of the SPD states that rear 'dormers should be contained well within the body of the roof,

by being set well back from the eaves, and by setting the sides well in from any gables or party walls'. Officer's sought revisions to the plans with the rear dormer being reduced reduced in size from a length of 8m with a spacing of only 0.2m to the eaves and 0.3m to the top of the roof to 5.2m in length with a spacing of 0.4m to the eaves and a much bigger spacing to the sides and top of the roof.

With respect to the proposed scheme the rear dormer would be well sited to the rear elevation. However, given the side extension is judged to be unacceptable, the ridge of the roof would need to be set down for the side extension to achieve compliance to the REA SPD. In doing so, the dormer would likely appear too dominate and bulky when set to the original main roof. The proposed rear dormer would be 5.2m wide and would encompass approximately 81% of the width of the roof of the original dwelling. This is a substantial coverage and it is difficult to argue this meets the requirements being 'well contained within the body of the roof'. Given the dwelling is on the corner the bulky rear dormer would be more prominent and appear as an intrusive element within the street scene.

While the dormer is likely compliant to policy in relation to this scheme it would unlikely to be viewed as acceptable should the side extension be revised as required.

As such, the proposed scheme would fail to appear appropriately subservient and would cause harm to the character of both the host dwelling and the surrounding street scene contrary to Policies 7 and 26 of the Local Plan and the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Careful consideration has been made on the impact on the amenity of the neighbours at no.35 and no.39.

There would be no impact on the adjoining neighbour at no.2 as the rear extension, side extension and rear dormer would not cause loss of light or overlooking. The rear extension meets the depth standard in the SPD and the side extension would be within the existing front and rear building lines. The dormer would not create any more overlooking than there is at present.

The neighbouring house to the rear of the house at no.24 Oxford Avenue would be approximately 13m away from the extensions and the houses to the west at no.25-no.31 Oxford Avenue would be approximately 20m away across the road.

There would be two windows on the flank wall of the side extension on the ground floor but there are no overlooking concerns as the nearest houses across the road at no.25-no.31 Oxford Avenue are approximately 20m away across the road.

The development would not unacceptably impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties and would be not be unneighbourly.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

A parking plan shows off-road parking for 2 cars. Policy 24 of the Havering Local Plan Adopted

November 2021 requires minimum of 1.5 spaces per 3+ bedroom unit in a rated PTAL-1b area; this is met.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is not considered to be in accordance with the above mentioned policies and guidance and ,therefore, a refusal is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1 Reason for refusal - Streetscene

The proposed side extension, by reason of its height, bulk and mass, in particular the excessive eave and ridge height, would not appear suitably subservient to the scale of the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the extension, by reason of its bulk and prominence within the street scene would appear as unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive harmful to the appearance of the both the host dwelling and the surrounding area contrary to Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan and the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

INFORMATIVES

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 further amendments beyond those initially requested, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal and the reason(s) for it was given to the agent via email on 26/07/2023.

Authorising Officer:



Simon Thelwell

28th July 2023