

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P1606.24

WARD: Emerson Park **Date Received:** 5th December 2024

ADDRESS: 108 Parkstone Avenue
Hornchurch

PROPOSAL: Roof alterations for conversion of loft with an increase in roof height, dormers and part hip to gable roof extensions

DRAWING NO(S): 24188_003
24188_004 B

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 detached residential 2-storey dwelling house. The property is not listed, nor is it within a conservation area but it is located in Sector 6 of the Emerson Park Policy Area. No trees will be affected as a result of this proposal. The surrounding area is residential in nature.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The applicant is seeking planning consent for roof alterations for conversion of the loft with an increase in roof height, dormers and part hip to gable roof extensions.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P0965.95	Single storey rear extension	
	Apprv with cons	11-10-1995
P1180.91	2 No. detached houses (Revised plans received 18/12/91 and 24/04/92)	
	Apprv with cons	02-06-1992

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Letters were sent to the immediate neighbouring properties. No objections have been received

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 8 Roof extensions, loft conversions and dormer windows

Emerson Park Policy Area Supplementary Planning Document Adopted February 2009

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.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The dwelling is located in Sector 6 of the Emerson Park Policy Area and the Emerson Park Policy Area Supplementary Planning Document states that 'each case will be treated on its merits and with regard to the extent that architectural character, massing and existing landscaping are retained. In every case, the space that is retained between buildings should reflect the character of the street scene in the immediate surroundings'.

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' and 'if the Council considers that a dormer facing the highway will not cause harm to the original house or street scene, its width should be no greater than 1.2 metres. The width should also not exceed the height (measured vertically between the highest and lowest points at which any part of the dormer intersects with the main roof). 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 combined width of a number of dormers on a roof facing the highway should not exceed half the width of the existing roof (measured at its mid-height)'.

The dormer facing the rear garden would be 2.3m wide with spacing to the tops and sides of the roof and is considered a suitable scale and design. The two dormers facing Wingletye Lane would be 1.6m wide, failing to meet SPD guidance and would appear bulky and prominent. The dormer facing the flank wall of no.199 Wingletye Lane would have a height and bulk that is excessive on this property and the view from Parkstone Avenue would be unbalanced with a bulky dormer on one roof slope and a smaller dormer on the other. The loft extension with part gabled ends is

acceptable in principle with similar designs nearby such as at no.199 Wingletye Lane. However the increased roof height from 8.8m in height to 9.3m would be excessive in the immediate street scene. No street elevation plans were provided with this planning application but according to planning history of houses nearby roof heights are generally lower, for example no.199 Wingletye Lane is shown to be 9m high in planning application P1161.05 and the houses opposite appear lower at around 8.7m in height (planning reference P0346.23 at no.214 Parkstone Avenue).

The cumulative impact of the part hip to gable roof extensions, the roof height, large and bulky dormer and unbalanced appearance would create a scheme that is a dominant and visually intrusive feature on this corner plot to the detriment of the visual amenity of the locality. 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 visual amenity of 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.

The loft extensions and roof height increase would create little impact in terms of loss of light or overshadowing; the flank wall at the nearest neighbouring dwelling at no.199 Wingletye Lane has no habitable room flank windows (planning application P1161.05 shows a study and WC on the ground floor and bathrooms on the first floor- the study is shown to be small at 5 square metres so is not deemed living space enough to warrant a refusal).

The dormers would not create overlooking issues; the separation distances from both 'side' elevations would mitigate loss of amenity due to overlooking. The dormer facing the side of no.199 Wingletye Lane is shown to serve a stairway and a bathroom so a condition should ensure that the glazing is obscure glazed and fixe shut 1.7m above the internal floor level to ensure no overlooking occurs.

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

HIGHWAY/PARKING

No highway issues.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is not considered to be in accordance with 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

The cumulative impact of the proposed roof extensions, height increase and dormers by reason of the height, bulk and mass would not appear suitably subservient to the scale of the existing dwelling and it would appear as a dominant and intrusive feature to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host property and visual amenity of the locality contrary to Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan and the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

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 amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, it was necessary to issue a decision as close to the statutory timeframe as possible as opposed to seeking amendments which would have significantly delayed the application.

Authorising Officer:



Neil Goate

4th February 2025