



Application Reference:	P2051.17
Location:	6 Brookside, Hornchurch
Ward:	Emerson Park
Description:	Two storey front extension, two storey side and rear extension with a room in the roof and increase in ridge height including front and rear dormer windows.
Case Officer:	Aidan Hughes
Reason for Report to Committee:	A Councillor call-in has been received.

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The application was called in by Councillor Roger Ramsey, in the event of a recommendation of refusal, prior to the implementation of the delegated power changes agreed by Governance Committee and Council. The call-in has been honoured on the basis on which it was originally lodged.

2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The proposed development, by reason of its excessive scale, bulk, mass, crowned roof form would appear incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene and rear garden environment. This will be harmful to the open and spacious character and appearance of the surrounding area.

3 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That the Committee resolve to REFUSE planning permission for the follow reason:
The proposal is considered to be unacceptable by reason of its excessive scale, bulk, mass, crowned roof form and resultant incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive impact in the streetscene and rear garden environment. This will be harmful to the open and spacious character and appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and the Emerson Park Policy Area SPD and Policies DC61 and DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

Informatives

1. INF31 Refusal no negotiations.

4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 4.1 Planning permission is sought for a two storey front extension, two storey side and rear extension with a room in the roof and increase in ridge height including front and rear dormer windows.

Site and Surroundings

- 4.2 The application site is located within Brookside and is in Sector 2 of the Emerson Park Policy Area. The site contains a two storey detached property finished in a mixture of face brick and painted render.
- 4.3 There is parking in the garage with three spaces on the drive. The surrounding area is characterised by two storey dwellings of various styles and designs.

Planning History

- 4.4 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

P1035.12 - Two storey rear extension and detached outbuilding to rear of garden - Approved (Not implemented, consent lapsed).

P1629.17 - Two storey side and rear extension with a room in the roof and increase in ridge height including front and rear dormer windows - Refused on grounds of visual impact in streetscene and rear garden environment. Appeal dismissed.

5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 5.1 No statutory consultations were required to be carried out in connection with this application.

6 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 13 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment, however no representations were received.
- 6.2 The following Councillor made representations:

Councillor Roger Ramsey wishes to call the application in on the grounds of the size and design.

7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:
 - The visual and amenity impact arising from the design and appearance of the proposal on the street and rear garden.

- Whether the grounds for refusal of the previous application P1629.17, which was also dismissed on appeal, have been overcome.

7.2 **Visual and amenity impact and application P1629.17**

- This application is a resubmission of a previously refused planning application P1629.17. The application was subsequently dismissed on appeal. The key issue in this case therefore is whether the revised proposal overcomes the previously stated concerns.
- The previous application was refused planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed development, by reason of its excessive depth, scale, bulk, mass, crowned roof form would appear incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene and rear garden environment. This will be harmful to the open and spacious character and appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and the Emerson Park Policy Area SPD and Policies DC61 and DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

- In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector did not raise concerns regarding the depth of the two storey rear extension but concerns were raised regarding the scale, bulk and mass of the crowned roof form.
- The Inspector commented that “the new extension would continue the line of the south elevation, producing a side elevation whose substantial bulk and scale would be discernible from the street. It would also marginally increase the existing roof height of this side of the building”.
- The Inspector stated the development would “fail to leave the original form of the building clearly legible, which would harm its character and appearance. The other roof forms of the adjacent buildings in Brookside predominantly comprise a mixture of hipped and gabled profiles. When viewed in this context, the proposed crown roof would be an incongruous form, and there is little evidence before me to suggest this is a common or prevalent roof type in the vicinity”.
- The Planning Inspector agreed with the Council that the 2012 scheme better reflected the character of the existing dwelling and therefore would be less visually harmful within the street scene
- On this submission the only differences between the previously refused (and dismissed) scheme and the current scheme is the altered design of the rear dormer window and the introduction of flank windows on either side of the proposed two storey rear extension. There has been no change to the crown roof design or the bulk and mass of the development.
- Mindful of the Planning Inspector's conclusion in respect of the appeal, Staff consider the changes to the previously refused scheme would not

bring the proposal within the realms of acceptability. There have been no material changes to the design of the extension and the crown roof form remains as previously. As such, the previous concerns regarding the excessive scale, bulk, mass and crowned roof form of the extension and its incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive impact in the street scene and rear garden environment remain. Therefore the grounds for the previous reason for refusal have not been overcome.

- The proposal is therefore contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD, the Emerson Park Policy Area SPD and Policies DC61 and DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.
- The impact on amenity was assessed on the previous application and found to be acceptable and this was reinforced by the Planning Inspector, however the only material change is the inclusion of the first floor flank windows.
- In the event that planning permission is given, it is recommended that the first floor flank windows should be conditioned to be obscured glazed and fixed shut apart from open-able fanlights.

7.3 Parking and Highway Implications

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

7.4 Local Financial Considerations

The proposal is not liable for Mayoral CIL.

8 Conclusions

All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.