

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0993.24

WARD: St Albans **Date Received:** 12th July 2024

ADDRESS: 40 Princes Road
Romford

PROPOSAL: first floor rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer, roof lights

DRAWING NO(S): 0001.1 C
0001.2 C
0001.3 C
0001.4 C
0001.5 C
0001.6 C
0001.7 C

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 is a semi-detached two storey dwelling located on the corner of a residential street. A driveway provides off street parking. The surrounding area consists of predominantly semi-detached. The property is finished in pebble dashing. The application site is not located within a conservation area nor subject to any articles.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for a first floor rear extension and rear dormer.

RELEVANT HISTORY

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

A consultation was carried with neighbouring sites in the area. 1 comment was received and summarised below.

-Three stories is going to stop light of neighbours also their privacy will be invaded

RELEVANT POLICIES

Havering Local Plan (2016)

- Policy 7 - Residential Design and Amenity
- Policy 26 - Urban Design

The London Plan (2021)

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

Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2011)

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

This proposal is not CIL applicable.

STAFF COMMENTS

In accordance with the current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken. Site photos, and block plans were provided by the applicant in the determination of the application as well as Google StreetView, aerial view images and drawings were used to assess the site constraints.

Amendments was sought and received which included changing the design of the dormer as well as reducing its scale along with changed to the roof form of the first floor rear extension. The applicant refused to make changes regarding the excessive width of the dormer.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The proposed first floor rear extension would project 3 metres, adhering to guidance as well as also being set in from the common boundary by over 5 metres, which is also within SPD guidelines. The roof form of the first floor rear extension is a hipped roof as favoured by SPD, therefore considered acceptable. The first floor rear extension would be visible from the street due to the application site being located on the corner, however given the design, would not be considered to have an adverse effect on the street scene.

The rear dormer would be 0.8 metres from each edge of the roof, 0.6 metres down from the main ridge and 0.3 metres up from the eaves, however, the dormer would span the width of the original roof slope as well as the roof of the side extension. With the site being located on a corner, the excessive width of the dormer combined with its prominence, would result in a dominant and visually intrusive feature, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host property and visual amenity of the locality. In addition, given the excessive width of the dormer it would also result in an awkward relationship with the proposed first floor rear extension, the roof of which the face of the

dormer would cut through.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

As per SPD, two storey rear extensions built up to the property boundary of the non-attached dwelling will not normally be acceptable. The first floor rear extension would be built up the boundary, however the building is already built up the boundary with a rear projecting feature also built up the boundary. As there is no immediate east neighbour due to the site being located on a corner there is limited concern regarding any impact to amenity. The first floor rear extension is also set in over 5 metres from the common boundary, ensuring no undue impact to the amenity of the attached neighbouring property No.42.

The rear dormer would result in harm to the visual amenity of nearby residents from the excessive width, scale and awkward relationship with the proposed design of the first floor rear extension.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

No highway or parking issues would be considered to arise as a result of the proposal.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

It is considered that the proposed development would not adhere to council high quality design policies and considered to have a negative impact on the street scene.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1 Refusal non standard

The proposed rear dormer, due to its excessive scale and prominent location on a corner plot, would appear overbearing and out of character with the host property and detrimental to the visual amenity of the surrounding area. The design is considered intrusive and would negatively impact the street scene contrary to Policies 7 and 26 of the Local Plan.

INFORMATIVES

1 Refusal - Amendments requested not made ENTER DETAILS

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework, improvements required to make the proposal acceptable were negotiated with agent via email 2nd October. The revisions involved reducing the width of the dormer to only extend on the original house, not side extension. The applicant declined to make the suggested revisions.

Authorising Officer:

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

Neil Goate

11th October 2024