

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0803.24

WARD: Cranham **Date Received:** 6th June 2024

ADDRESS: 11A Stour Way
Upminster

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

DRAWING NO(S): 24143-WA-001
24143-WA-002
24143-WA-003
24143-WA-004
24143-WA-005 Revision A
24143-WA-006 Revision B
24143-WA-007 Revision B

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

SITE DESCRIPTION

Residential, two storey end terraced dwelling finished in painted render. Parking on the drive and in the garage to the front of the property. The application site has a triangular garden and the property is located on a bend where the neighbouring terraced group projects forward of the terraced group in which the application dwelling forms part of. The surrounding area is characterised by two storey terraced dwellings.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a part single, part two storey side and single storey rear extension with new patio/fencing and front porch following demolition of existing garage and loft conversion with rear dormer and roof lights to front.

RELEVANT HISTORY

681/54 - Housing development - Approved.

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Three representations were received as part of the planning process from the same resident with their comments summarised below:

- Loss of light and privacy from the proposal.
- Query regarding fencing.

The above comments will be considered within the following sections of the report. The Planning Officer contacted the resident to follow up on their query regarding the fencing.

RELEVANT POLICIES

- For ease of reference, the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD will be referred as "SPD".

LONDON PLAN:

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

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

This application is not CIL liable because the newly created floor space does not exceed 100 square metres.

STAFF COMMENTS

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.

It should be noted that no pre-application advice was sought prior to the submission of the application and it is considered that the changes required to try and bring the proposal within the realms of acceptability would not be minor.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

No objections are raised to the proposed front porch which would be located within the middle of the extended dwelling, well away from both side boundaries and acceptably designed.

The SPD outlines that "for an even row of terraces, side extensions should normally continue the existing building line of the front elevation, so that the architectural rhythm of the street is maintained. However, a subordinate approach may be more appropriate where the terrace is staggered or where the merging together of two adjacent terraced blocks is considered harmful to the street scene. Side extensions should not project beyond the main building line".

The application dwelling forms part of a group of six terraced properties within Stour Way with the detached group projecting forward of the application site. The properties are located on a bend.

The existing garage would be demolished to make way for the proposed two storey side extension. The two storey side extension would have a width of 2.8m and the front of the extension would be set off the boundary with No.11 Stour Way by approximately 3.3m and this would decrease to approximately 1.65m to the rear.

Roof extensions and alterations can change the appearance and character of the dwelling, particularly when alterations are made to the front elevation.

The proposal will convert a hipped roof to a gable end roof to the main dwelling. It is noted that the other end of the terraced group has a hipped roof. It is considered that altering the existing hip roof on the terraced group to a gable end roof would not continue the architectural rhythm of the street.

It is noted that some properties in the area have altered their roof from a hip to gable under permitted development which the Council has no control over. However, these examples show how altering the roof design would impact on the character of the terraced group and would set an undesirable precedent.

In addition, the proposal would also include a two storey side extension which would also have a gabled roof which would further upset the architectural rhythm of the terraced group.

The scale and bulk of altering the existing roof and the two storey side would cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This will significantly increase the overall bulk and mass of the building when viewed from the street and entirely changes its visual proportions.

Where the Council has control over such proposals and hipped roofs form a characteristic of the house and/or street, a gable end will not be considered acceptable.

It is considered that the introduction of a gabled roof to the terraced group within a street of predominately hip roofs would look out of place.

Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan which is in respect to Urban Design outlines that:

The Council will promote high quality design that contributes to the creation of successful places in

Havering.

It is considered that the proposal would fail to comply with the following part of the policy -

- i. Are informed by, respect and complement the distinctive qualities, identity, character and geographical features of the site and local area;
- ii. Are of a high architectural quality and design;
- iv. Respect, reinforce and complement the local streetscene;
- vii. Respond to distinctive local building forms and patterns of development and respect the visual integrity and established scale, massing, rhythm of the building, frontages, group of buildings or the building line and height of the surrounding physical context;

It is considered that the conversion of the hip to gable roof would be at odds with the design, pattern and uniformity of the street scene as it would interrupt the rhythm of the terraced group and the properties relationship within the street.

Collectively, they form a distinctive character in this part of Stour Way, creating a pleasant and generally cohesive appearance. By providing the dwelling with a gabled ended roof and large rear dormer window, this cohesion and symmetry is lost; the resultant dwellings appear incongruous in the midst of the other matching pairs and it is considered that overall this is of detriment to the established character and this part of the streetscene.

This application has been determined on its own individual merits and it is considered that the proposal due to the scale and bulk of the proposed roof alteration would appear as an incongruous and unacceptably visually intrusive feature in the street scene and rear garden environment.

As a result, it is considered that the proposed roof alteration from a hip to gable roof would appear as an incongruous and unacceptably visually harmful feature in the street scene and rear garden environment harmful to the appearance of the host property, the prevailing character of development and visual amenity in the surrounding area contrary to Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan, D4 of the London Plan and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

The proposed development including the hip to gable roof alteration and rear dormer window would also be visible from the rear garden environment and would exacerbate the scale and bulk of the proposal.

The proposed rear dormer window and single storey rear extension would be mainly visible from the rear garden environment with oblique views from the rear along Isis Drive and Severn Drive. The alterations to the rear would not be visible from the street to the front, as it would be screened by the proposed two storey side extension and the neighbouring dwellings on either side.

The proposed single storey rear extension and patio/fencing would be of an acceptable design and will relate well with the existing dwelling in terms of bulk, scale and massing and therefore would not impact on the rear garden environment. No objections are raised from a visual point of view.

However, the proposed rear dormer window would be at ridge height and would cover a significant amount of the roof of the original dwelling as altered with its proposed gable roof.

The SPD outlines that:

"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. Dormers must never extend above the ridge line of the roof and should be located well below it. All windows at roof level, particularly dormers, should relate to the windows of the original house in proportion, design and position".

It is considered that the scale and bulk of the rear dormer window would be excessive and ideally, it needs to be contained more within the roof space. There are other rear dormers within the area but the majority of these have been constructed under permitted development and the Council has no control over the design or size.

As a result, the proposed rear dormer window would, by reason of its height, position and bulk appear out of scale and character with the dwelling and materially harmful to the visual amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Havering Local Plan Policy 26, London Plan Policy D4 and the design guidance within the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the impact on neighbouring dwellings in terms of loss of light and loss of privacy.

The two storey side extension and hip to gable roof alterations would be located on the south east side of the dwelling. It is not envisaged that this part of the proposal would have any impact on the amenity of the attached neighbour at No.13 Stour Way as they are located to the north west and the separation distance would mitigate any potential impact as the proposal would be located on the opposite side of the dwelling.

It is noted that No.13 has a single storey rear extension which would partly mitigate the proposed single storey rear extension.

An overall projection beyond No.13's rear extension of approximately 0.67m is not unusual and is envisaged within guidelines as acceptable when considering the impact of a 3m deep extension on the boundary with a neighbour that has not previously extended. As a result, it is considered that the neighbouring rear extension would mitigate the depth of the proposed single storey rear extension.

The height of the patio from the information provided would be less than 30cm, and therefore could be potentially added under permitted development. However, as it is shown as part of this application, measures need to be undertaken to safeguard the privacy of the adjoining neighbours.

Revised plans were provided during the process to clarify that a 1.7m high fence would be erected adjacent to the patio with No.13, however, there is no side elevation from the other side to corroborate the same mitigation for No.11A.

Photos indicate that there is variation in ground level between 11 and 11A, and that the application dwelling projects further back into plot. Clarification will be required on any re-submission in respect to the new boundary treatment. However, the patio would be well removed from the rear elevation of No.11 patio to the rear of their dwelling which is the most private part of a garden by approximately 9.8m. The fence at an overall height at 2m would screen views, however greater clarification would be required on any resubmission.

Of a greater concern is the potential impact on the detached neighbour at No.11 Stour Way which lies to east/south east of the application site. Due to the staggered relationship both the proposed two storey side and single storey rear extensions would project further back into the plot than this neighbouring property.

As mentioned, the two storey side extension would be set off the boundary with No.11 Stour Way by approximately 3.3m and this would decrease to approximately 1.65m to the rear. The gap would decrease further when combined with the ground floor rear extension.

It is noted that this neighbour at No.11 has a patio and several openings facing the rear garden.

An equivalent degree of amenity should be secured for the neighbouring dwelling on the non-attached boundary both in terms of the existing house and rear garden and in terms of the ability to build an extension in line with this SPD.

As a general rule, houses can be extended from the rear wall of the original dwelling by up to 3m in depth for a terraced dwelling. Any greater depth should fall within a 45 degree notional line from the boundary at the 3m point from the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling. This assessment is used in order to ensure a reasonable level of amenity is afforded to neighbouring properties.

It is noted the first floor side extension would infringe a notional line taken from the boundary in line with the rear elevation of No.11 Stour Way. This notional line is created by a 2m separation distance and the 3m depth of the extension. The impact would be exacerbated by having a gabled roof close to the boundary and mindful that the proposal would be built closer to the boundary with this neighbour at two storey and in conjunction with the staggered relationship.

It is considered that the proposed single storey rear and first floor side extensions would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring residents at No.11 Stour Way and would unacceptably overbear and dominate the outlook and amenity of this neighbour.

As a result, it is considered that the proposed development will give rise to a significant natural light loss and provide a "wall of development" which will give rise to an uncomfortable overbearing effect and sense of enclosure harmful to their amenity, mindful that this neighbour lies to the north of the application site. The harmful would be from both the rear facing rooms and the patio area of the adjacent property.

The proposal is deemed unneighbourly and therefore fails to comply with guidance set out in the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The application site is within a PTAL area of 1b. Policy 24 of the Havering Local Plan is applied for a site within a PTAL 0-1 that has 3 plus bedrooms. The site needs to provide a minimum parking provision of 1.5 space per dwelling which is rounded up to two parking spaces.

It is noted that the existing garage would be lost as a consequence of the proposed development. However, photographic evidence clearly shows that this can be accomplished within the site and therefore no objections are raised.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is considered to be contrary to the above-mentioned policies and guidance and a refusal is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1 Reason for refusal - Streetscene & Rear Garden

The proposed roof alteration from a hip to gable roof would appear as an incongruous and unacceptably visually harmful feature in the street scene and rear garden environment harmful to the appearance of the host property, the prevailing character of development and visual amenity in the surrounding area contrary to Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan, D4 of the London Plan and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

2 Reason for refusal - Dormers

The proposed rear dormer window would, by reason of its height, position and bulk appear out of scale and character with the dwelling and materially harmful to the visual amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Havering Local Plan Policy 26, London Plan Policy D4 and the design guidance within the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

3 Reason for refusal - Residential Extensions

The proposed development would, by reason of its excessive height, depth and position close to the boundaries of the site, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers at No.11 Stour Way, Upminster contrary to Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

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 Mr Walsh by e-mail on 06/08/24.

Authorising Officer:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Raphael Adenegan', written in a cursive style.

Raphael Adenegan

7th August 2024