

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0170.25

WARD: Cranham

Date Received: 6th February 2025

ADDRESS: 77 Marlborough Gardens
Upminster

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing attached garage, proposed two storey side and single storey rear extensions, front entrance extension to include canopy roof at front, hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and roof lights to front.

DRAWING NO(S): PM.DJA.1
PM.DJA.2
PM.DJA.3
PM.DJA.4
PM.DJA.5
PM.DJA.6
PM.DJA.7
PM.DJA.8A
PM.DJA.9
PM.DJA.10
PM.DJA.11
PM.DJA.SUPPLEMENTARY DRG 1
Location Plan

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 features a two storey semi-detached residential dwellinghouse with a hipped roof. It benefits from a side garage.

The site is not listed, nor is located within a conservation area.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of existing attached garage, proposed two storey side and single storey rear extensions, front entrance extension to include canopy roof at front, hip

to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and roof lights to front.

RELEVANT HISTORY

ES/HOR 542/53 - Residential Development (Refused)

ES/HOR 1054/57 - Of 8 Houses (Approved)

L/HAV 575/73 - Loft Conversion (Refused)

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Surrounding neighbouring properties, including ones which adjoin the application site were consulted about this application. No representations were received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

NPPF

London Plan:

- Policy D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth
- Policy D4 - Delivering good design
- Policy T6.1 - Residential car parking

Havering Borough Council Local Plan (2016-2031):

- Policy 7 - Residential design and amenity
- Policy 24 - Parking provision and design
- Policy 26 - Urban design

The Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

This application is not CIL liable because the new floor space created by the development would not exceed 100 square metres.

STAFF COMMENTS

In accordance with the LPA's current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken during the application process as one was not considered to be necessary. In determining this application, site photographs, aerial images, Google 3D images and the submitted drawings were used to assess the proposal and the site's constraints.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The scheme proposes the conversion of the host dwelling's existing hipped roof to a gabled end.

The SPD states that "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 noted that there are other semi-detached dwellings along Marlborough Gardens that have undertaken hip-to-gable roof conversions, such as nos. 53, 81, 96 and 98. It is noted that all of these properties also benefit from a rear dormer. However, there are no Council records of an application submitted to the LPA for a loft conversion at nos. 53 or 81, suggesting that the hip-to-gable roof conversions at both properties were undertaken using permitted development rights. As for nos. 96 and 98, they were both granted Lawful Development Certificates for their loft conversions (under applications D0049.14 and D0137.22 respectively).

It is also acknowledged that there are other properties nearby - such nos. 90 and 94 - which were previously granted planning permission for roof extensions (under P2035.03 and P0825.06 respectively), but those roof extensions involved the provision of a half-hipped roof, which allowed these two properties to retain some symmetry with their attached hipped roof neighbours. Contrastingly, it is considered the fully gabled roof that is proposed under this application would completely destroy any symmetry between the host dwelling and its attached neighbour.

Therefore, it is deemed that the proposed hip-to-gable roof conversion would be unacceptable as it would significantly increase the bulk and mass of the dwelling at roof level when viewed from the street, entirely changing its visual proportions and resulting in the unbalancing the pair of semi-detached properties, something which would be detrimental to the symmetry between the two houses.

The scheme also proposes a part single, part two storey side extension. This element of the proposal would have a 350mm set back from the front wall of the main dwelling at first floor level and therefore would not be subservient to the main dwelling as it would fail to comply with guidelines in the SPD for two storey side extensions to semi-detached properties which require a 1m setback at least.

It is acknowledged that this part of the road also contains a number of properties with first floor or two storey side extensions that do not have a 1m set back as required by the SPD, such as at nos. 51, 59, 85 and 97. However, examination of the planning history for these properties shows that these are all historic extensions that were granted planning consent well before current guidelines (all before the 1990s).

The side extension would also benefit from a flat roof, which would not be in-keeping with the roof style of the main dwelling and thus further exacerbate the appearance of the extension as an unrelated and visually intrusive addition to the subject property.

It is noted that the attached neighbour no. 75 Marlborough Gardens benefits from a part single, part two storey side extension with a hipped roof. Based on the plans submitted for the planning application for that extension to the LPA (reference: P0640.22), the extension has a 1m set back at

first floor level. Therefore, the proposed side extension would also due to its lack of set back and flat roof design exacerbate the unbalancing between the semi-detached pair of properties and thus cause harm to the visual amenity of both properties from the street through.

A rear dormer measuring approximately 5.5m wide, 2.98m deep and 2.5m high is also proposed as part of this application.

With regards to dormer windows, the SPD states 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. Dormers with pitched roofs set at right angles to the main roof are preferred".

The proposed rear dormer would not be set well in from the sides of the host dwelling or up from the eaves but, given examination of the locality shows there are box-style rear dormers of similar or wider widths at other properties along Marlborough Gardens, such as at nos. 90, 94 and 97, on balance, it is not considered the bulk, scale and massing of the proposed rear dormer would be so harmful to the character and appearance of the rear garden scene so as to warrant a refusal.

The ground floor rear extension is considered to relate acceptably to the host dwelling in terms of its bulk, scale and massing. No objections are therefore raised to this aspect of the scheme from a design point-of-view.

Nor are any objections are raised to the proposed front extension with canopy or front roof lights from a visual standpoint.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the impacts of the proposed development on neighbouring amenity.

The part single, part two storey side extension would be located on the northern side of the host dwelling. As the attached neighbours are located on the opposite side, well away from this element of the proposals, it is judged this extension would not cause harm to their amenity.

The unattached neighbours benefit from a first floor flank window that would be affected by the side extension proposed. Based on the plans submitted for extensions to this neighbour in 2016 (application reference: P1049.16), this window serves a staircase. Less weight is applied to the impact of the proposal on such a window. The first floor of the proposed side extension would be located hard up along the shared boundary and extend approximately 1.5m beyond the rear of the unattached neighbour. However, given the minimal projection of this part of the extension beyond the rear of this neighbour coupled with the fact that a 45-degree notional line taken from the centre of the nearest first floor rear window of this neighbouring property (a bathroom based on P1049.16) would not be infringed upon by the extension, it is not considered that significant harm would be caused to the amenity of this neighbour from the proposed side extension. Therefore, its impact on this neighbour is considered to be within acceptable realms.

The ground floor rear extension would be policy compliant in terms of its depth and height and therefore, it is considered its impacts on the neighbours either side of the subject property would be acceptable.

With regards to the amenity impacts of the rear dormer proposed, it is acknowledged that there is potential for overlooking from this development into the rear gardens of the attached and unattached neighbours. However, this is not considered to be significantly greater than any overlooking from first floor rear windows that currently exists in the locality. It is thus deemed the impacts of the rear dormer on the amenity of both neighbours either side of the application site would be within reasonable tolerances.

The front roof lights proposed would face the street, a public area and therefore are not considered to cause harm to the amenity of surrounding neighbours. It is also not considered that the proposed hip-to-gable roof conversion or front extension with canopy would cause harm to neighbouring amenity.

All other neighbouring properties are considered to be sufficiently separated from the proposed developments such that they would not suffer harm to their amenity.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The existing side garage would be demolished as part of the proposals, which would result in the loss of a car parking space.

However, given there is a hardstanding area to the front of the host dwelling that provides space for parking for two cars, no highways or parking issues are judged to arise from the proposal.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposed developments are considered to be contrary to the above-mentioned policies and guidance.

As such, the REFUSAL of planning permission is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1 Refusal non standard

The proposed hip-to-gable roof alteration would alter the basic shape of the roof on the semi-detached house which is unacceptable as it would give rise to a visually heavy roof to one half of the semi-detached pair of properties, something which would have a negative effect on the street scene by creating a loss of symmetry between the two properties. The proposal is accordingly considered to be of a poor quality design and contrary to the purposes and intent of Local Plan Policies 7 and 26 as well as the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

2 Refusal non standard

The proposed part single, part two storey side extension, by reason of its limited setback first floor level and flat roof design, would fail to be subservient to the host property and as such would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and exacerbate the loss of symmetry between the pair of properties, contrary to Policies 7 and 26 of the Local Plan as well as the 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:



Raphael Adenegan

9th April 2025