

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
8th January 2015

APPLICATION NO:	P1466.13	
WARD :	Pettits	Date Received: 3rd December 2013 Expiry Date: 28th January 2014
ADDRESS:	58 Parkway Gidea Park Romford	
PROPOSAL:	Proposed construction of single storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and a two storey rear extension and various alterations.	
	Revised Plans Received 06.11.2014	
DRAWING NO(S):	Drawing No. 209 Rev. C Drawing No. 210 Rev. C Drawing No. 100 Rev. A Drawing No. 001 Rev. A Drawing No. 101 Rev. A	
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report given at the end of the report.	

CALL-IN

The matter has been called in to Committee by Councillor Misir on the grounds that the impact on the conservation area should be considered by Members rather than at officer level.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to the property 58 Parkway, Gidea Park in Romford. The property is a 1911 Exhibition House and is located within the Gidea Park Conservation Area and as such is subject to a Article 4 Direction. This is a two-storey detached house, with a single storey lean-to store structure to the side, parking area and garden to the front and spacious garden to the rear. The site is located opposite to the Raphael Park tennis courts and the surrounding area is predominantly residential and recreational in character.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The application has been revised on several occasions since its first submission. As such the application is seeking planning permission for the construction of single storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and a two storey rear extension with various alterations.

The single storey side extension would replace the existing timber store structure, projecting 1.8m from the side elevation of the house to within 0.3m of the side boundary with No.60 Parkway. The front section of the extension would include a 0.7m set back from the main front elevation and a 3.2m set back from the rear elevation. The single storey extension would incorporate a mono-pitched roof design and would include a front window with the design matching the style and proportions of the existing house.

An extension would project 4m from the main rear elevation at single storey level, set in 1.8m from the boundary with No.60 Parkway and 1.9m from the boundary with No.56. This section of the extension would incorporate a flat roof and a contemporary light weight glazed design

including large aluminium glazed sliding doors.

At first floor level the extension would project 3m across half of the main rear elevation providing an extension to the master bedroom. The first floor section will incorporate a hipped pitched roof design, matching the roof slope of the existing front section of the dwelling. The proposed windows in the first floor section would be timber casements with leaded lights matching the style and proportions of the existing 1911 exhibition house.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P0784.09 - Repainting of existing timber framed windows from black to grey
Apprv with cons 29-07-2009

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

It should be noted that several amendments have been made to the proposal since the original consultation. Following the formal submission of amended plans a re-consultation was undertaken on 6 November 2014. Neighbour notification letters were sent to 6 properties and 2 representations have been received. The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The revised plan appears as even more unacceptably dominant.
- The proposed depth would not adhere to a 45 degree angle.
- The revisions would result in a loss of light to the side of No.56.
- The new windows in the side elevation would overlook the side window at No.56.
- The boundary hedge has not been drawn accurately on the submitted plan and would offer less screening than shown.
- The side extension will be too close to the boundary harming the separated character of the Parkway Exhibition Houses.
- From a practical viewpoint it will be very difficult to maintain the side wall of the extension as it is so close to the boundary and will close in the narrow gap between the flank wall and boundary fence.
- The scale and massing of the proposed extension will result in an excessive increase.
- Loss of views over open space against the garden suburb principles of the Exhibition estate.
- Loss of privacy in back garden due to installation of proposed first floor windows.

Gidea Park Civic Society - objected to the proposal on the grounds that the size, scale and contemporary design of the proposed extensions would harm the Gidea Park Conservation Area and not be in-keeping with the character and appearance of the 1911 Exhibition house.

Heritage Officer - no objections to the revised scheme. The amendments to the current proposal have been formed and directed following advice given through a series of lengthy discussions with the architect.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

- CP18 - Heritage
- DC61 - Urban Design
- DC67 - Buildings of Heritage Interest
- DC68 - Conservation Areas
- DC69 - Other Areas of Special Townscape or Landscape Character
- SPD2 - Heritage SPD

LDF

SPD4 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

SPD9 - Residential Design SPD

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

There are no Mayoral CIL implications for application.

STAFF COMMENTS

The main issues relate to the impact on the character and appearance of the Gidea Park Conservation Area, the impact of the extensions and alterations on a 1911 Exhibition House regarded as a heritage asset and the implications for the residential amenity of the neighbouring residential dwellings.

CONSERVATION AREA

The Heritage SPD sets out specific design principles for conservation areas and states that extensions should be subordinate to the mass and height of the main building and complementary in terms of design, detailing and materials. The SPD goes on to recognise the notable characteristics of the Gidea Park 1911 Exhibition Houses, stating amongst other things, that key characteristics include a complex roof profile, emphasis on horizontally proportioned windows, timber casement windows with a small pane glazing and rough cast render painted in pale tones and a plain clay tile. Policy DC68 states that the character of Conservation Areas will be preserved or enhanced.

58 Parkway is an original 1911 Exhibition property and the house is considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The side extension will replace an existing lean-to timber structure, which is a later addition to the dwelling and encloses the area to the side of the house offering little in visual quality to enhance the appearance of the conservation area. The proposed window to the front of the extension would match the style and proportions of the original house.

Internal alterations and the conversion of the garage store to part of the enlarged kitchen would involve the removal of the existing double timber doors and result in the roof being recessed back to the eaves line of the original roof. This aspect of the proposal would see the altered elevation rendered in matching materials and the installation of a new window matching those of the original dwelling.

The proposed ground floor rear extension will be of a contemporary light weight glazed design incorporating a flat roof. Although predominantly glazed along the frontage the side sections will be finished with a matching white render.

The two storey element of the extension to the rear would replicate the projecting section of the main front elevation, emphasising the sympathetic nature of the addition and allowing the 1911 Exhibition House to largely retain its original form and appearance from views along Parkway. Although the two storey extension would not necessarily be subordinate to the height of the original building, it is considered that a reduced roof height on the extension would jar with the existing roof ridge line arrangement and take on an incongruous appearance that would be harmful to the character of the dwelling. Therefore in this instance a continuous ridge line from front to rear is judged to be more respectful of the building's individual character and aesthetic.

The proposed single storey section of the rear extension will project 4 metres from the main back wall of the dwelling and has been designed to be a contemporary, light-weight addition to the dwelling. The form and style of the extension would contrast to some extent with the architecture of the original sections of the property, however, it is considered that the design maintains a strong link with the garden setting, thus reflecting the character of the area as a garden suburb.

The lighter modern touch of the single storey element would also provide a modern, open planned living space whilst preserving the integrity of the heritage asset by not attempting to replicate and create pastiche extensions which cannot follow the special arts and crafts style identically. Given the more simplistic nature of the two storey section, this element of the development is easier to replicate without causing undue harm to the character of the dwelling. As a result it is considered that the combination of traditional and modern styles provides a positive addition to the Exhibition House, and would suitably preserve the special character and appearance of the conservation area in accordance with Policies DC68 and the Heritage SPD.

In this instance, it is considered that a pastiche design would not have been a suitable approach to this building, as it would have compromised the architecture of the 1911 house, and therefore the character of the Conservation Area. As each of the 1911 houses were individually architecturally designed properties, this would be an individual, architecturally designed extension which responds sympathetically to the design and setting of this specific property.

It is acknowledged that the contemporary style of the proposed extensions are an alternative design approach to what has previously been applied to extensions and alterations within the Gidea Park Conservation Area. However, the recent contemporary extensions to the property at 5 Risebridge Road under application P1197.11 have demonstrated how this approach can be applied successfully.

The submitted plans indicate that the existing timber casement windows and leaded lights within the dwelling are to be overhauled and repaired. There are no objections in principle to these works which would improve the appearance of the dwelling. No details have been provided as to the extent of the repair works proposed however further details can be secured via condition.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Policy DC61 states that planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/ daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy to existing properties.

The proposed rear extensions would project out 4m from the existing main rear wall at ground floor and 3m at first floor level, both of which are distances advised as being acceptable projections for a detached dwelling under the guidance of the Residential Extensions and Alteration SPD. In addition the extension would not project beyond the rear building line of existing rear extensions at both No.s 56 & 60 Parkway.

In terms of the impact on No.56, the proposal would be set in from the boundary by a minimum of 1.6m. No.56 has a ground floor kitchen window in the side elevation which appears to have been installed or enlarged after the house was originally constructed. The kitchen window provides some outlook over the garden of the application site, albeit through the trellis of the boundary fence. The proposed extension would be located to the north of No.56 and as such would not result in overshadowing to the neighbouring property. The extension would comply with the projection requirements for a detached dwelling and would be set-in from the boundary,

respecting the rear building line of the extension at No.56. Any loss of daylight or outlook from the side window as a result of the proposed extension would be no more severe than the effects from the installation of a 2m high boundary fence or hedgerow and as such it is not considered in this instance to be exceptionally harmful to the occupants amenity.

The proposed additional first floor en-suite bathroom window in the side elevation will be obscure glazed to prevent overlooking of No.56 and to protect privacy.

In terms of the impact on No.60 Parkway the rear extension will be sited 1.8m from the boundary, incorporating a flat roof with a height of 2.87m. The proposal has been amended significantly and the side section forming an 'L-shape' link to the side extension has now been removed from the current scheme, considerably reducing the impact on No.60. The single storey extension will adopt a similar projection to the existing rear conservatory at No.60 and given the height of the proposed extension and distance from the boundary will not result in any undue impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupants.

The side extension will be 2.4m in height up to the eaves with a mono-pitched roof rising to 3.4m, but will in effect replace an existing structure in this location. The proposed extension would be higher, but will be located 0.3m away from the boundary with No.60. Given the limited height of the extension it is considered that it would not be harmful to the amenity of the neighbouring property and as a replacement to the existing structure would not be more materially harmful than the existing situation. This element of the proposal is therefore also judged to be acceptable.

On balance it is considered that the proposed side and rear extensions would not result in an undue impact on the amenity of the neighbouring residents at No.s56 & 60 Parkway and as a result the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the provisions of Policy DC61 and the the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The proposed extensions would be located to the side and rear will not effect the existing off street car parking arrangements and therefore the proposal presents no highway or parking issues.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposed extensions are considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the 1911 Exhibition House, and as such, preserve the character and appearance of the Gidea Park Conservation Area. Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report

1. S SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

2. M SC09 (Materials)

Before any of the development hereby permitted is commenced, samples of all materials to be used in the external construction of the extensions, including render, brick, tile and other roofing materials as well as the proposed fenestration shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

Reason:-

To ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding area and comply with Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

3. S SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans, particulars and specifications.

Reason:-

The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

4. SC34 (Obscure glazing) ENTER DETAILS

The proposed windows, namely the first floor en-suite bathroom window in the south side elevation of the dwelling and the proposed high level ground floor window in the side elevation of the single storey rear extension, shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass and thereafter be maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of privacy, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

5. SC46 (Standard flank window condition)

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, no window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted plan,) shall be formed in the flank wall(s) of the building(s) hereby permitted, unless specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In order to ensure a satisfactory development that will not result in any loss of privacy or damage to the environment of neighbouring properties which exist or may be proposed in the future, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

6. S SC48 (Balcony condition)

6. S SC48 (Balcony condition)

The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwelling, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

7. Non standard condition

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a detailed specification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for a) the windows to be refurbished (on a window by window basis). The works shall be carried in strict accordance with the agreed specification.

Reason: To preserve the character and appearance of the original house and the character of the Gidea Park Conservation Area.

INFORMATIVES

1 Approval following revision

Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Improvements required to make the proposal acceptable were negotiated and submitted, in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
8th January 2015

APPLICATION NO:	P0133.14	
WARD :	Heaton	Date Received: 10th February 2014 Expiry Date: 26th February 2015
ADDRESS:	Land to the R/O 70 Straight Road Romford	
PROPOSAL:	Creation of 1 No. 2 bed bungalow. Revised Plans received 8/7/2014 an revised description	
DRAWING NO(S):	X10 PL60 PL61 PL62	
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the reason(s) given at the end of the report given at the end of the report.	

CALL-IN

The application has been called before the Regulatory Services Committee by Councillor Steven Kelly for consideration as the applicant has reduced the number of bungalows from two to one.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is to the rear of No. 70 and 70a Straight which consists of a inter-war semidetached house which has recently been extended to form a terrace of 3 dwellings. The site is situated on the eastern side of Straight Road, within a predominantly residential area to the north east of the centre of Romford. The site has at the front onto Straight Road and Appledore Close to the rear.

The site is adjoined to the north by a public footpath which gives pedestrian access to Appledore Close to the rear of the site.

Ground levels fall away to the rear of the site. The surrounding area is residential in character and comprises of two storey terraced dwellings with the exception of a vehicle service yard to the north.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes a 2-bedroom detached bungalow to the rear of No. 70 and 70a Straight Road. The proposed bungalow would measure 8.7m in overall depth and 10.3m in width. The bungalow will be finished with a hipped ended roof to a height of 2.6m to eaves and 4.9m to the ridge. The proposed bungalow would consist of a kitchen/lounge area, bathroom and 2 no. bedrooms. The bungalow will be set approximately 1m off the northern and southern boundaries and 3.4m off the rear (western) and front (eastern) boundaries. Parking space would be provided for 1 vehicles on a hardstanding to the front of the bungalow. Access to bungalow would be gained via an approximately 3m wide access off Appledore Close.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P1213.13 - Creation of 2 no. 1-bed bungalow dwellings
Withdrawn 16-12-2013

- P1442.12 - Proposed creation of new 2 Bedroom dwelling
Apprv with Agreement 01-04-2014
- P1904.11 - Single/two storey side/rear extension
Apprv with cons 05-03-2012
- P1409.10 - Three bedroom dwelling to the side of the existing house.
Refuse 09-12-2010
- P1641.08 - erection of a two bed room infill house to the side of the existing house
Lapsed application 21-12-2011
- P1319.08 - Erection of new house
Withdrawn 16-09-2008
- P0256.08 - Erection of a 2 bedroom infill house to the side of the existing house
Refuse 09-06-2008
- P0385.91 - Conversion to residential home for The Elderly including 2 storey side & rear extension, single storey front and rear extensions and dormer windows
Refuse 18-07-1991

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbouring notification letters were sent to 62 neighbouring occupiers and 9 letters of objection were received objecting to the proposal on the grounds, among other things, not sufficient parking and traffic problems, over-development of the site, out of keeping with surrounding area, increase in noise and pedestrian safety.

The London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority Brigade has raised no objection to the proposal.

Environmental Health requested soil and land contamination conditions. Also, a conditions is requested for sound insulation and limited construction hours.

The Highways Authority have raise an objection to the lack of sufficient parking provided.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

- CP1 - Housing Supply
- CP17 - Design
- DC2 - Housing Mix and Density
- DC3 - Housing Design and Layout
- DC33 - Car Parking
- DC35 - Cycling
- DC61 - Urban Design
- DC72 - Planning Obligations
- SPD9 - Residential Design SPD

OTHER

- LONDON PLAN - 3.3 - Increasing housing supply

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 3.4 - Optimising housing potential
LONDON PLAN - 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments
LONDON PLAN - 3.8 - Housing choice
LONDON PLAN - 6.13 - Parking
LONDON PLAN - 6.9 - Cycling
LONDON PLAN - 7.4 - Local character
LONDON PLAN - 8.3 - Community infrastructure Levy
NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed development is liable for the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in accordance with London Plan Policy 8.3. The applicable fee is based on an internal gross floor area of 63m² and amounts to £1260.

STAFF COMMENTS

The main considerations in this case are the principle of development, the density, layout, scale, design and the impact of the development in the street scene, the impact on the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers and highways, access and parking issues.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

In deciding whether the development of the rear garden land, for the erection of a new detached dwelling, provides justification for such a development, it is of relevance to consider the change in government policy which involved the revision to delete gardens from the classification of "previously developed land" as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

This does not mean that such development is automatically unacceptable, but it results in the presumption in favour of its development, as previously developed land, being removed. As a result, any application has to be determined on its merits in line with development plan policy and taking into account other material considerations.

DENSITY/SITE LAYOUT

The site is located within a low ranked Public Transport Accessibility Level Zone (PTAL 1-2). Within this zone, housing density of between 30-50 dwellings per hectare is anticipated. The site comprises 0.048ha. The proposal would produce a density of 62 dwellings per hectare. In this instance the density is above the density range, however density on its own may not be a reason for refusal as other design issues should also be considered.

The proposed dwelling would be served by usable amenity areas to the rear and front totalling approximately 53m². Also, the amenity space of No. 70 and 70a Straight Road would be reduced to approximately 51m² and 33m² respectively. The level of provision to the proposed and existing dwellings are considered to be unsatisfactorily for the size of development and given the size of existing gardens to established properties in the immediate area. The amenity space provided to the existing dwelling and proposed bungalow would be inadequate and insufficient for the requirements of day to day living, out of keeping with the surrounding properties.

In broader layout terms, the proposed bungalow in the rear garden environment, given its position close to neighbouring boundaries and small rear garden, would result in development which would appear cramped and uncharacteristic in the rear garden environment and surrounding area. Staff are of the opinion that the proposal would stand out as a separate entity and would not integrate well within this rear garden environment and surrounding area.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Plan Document seeks to ensure that new developments are satisfactorily located and are of a high standard of design and layout. Furthermore, the appearance of new developments should be compatible with the character of the surrounding area, and should not prejudice the environment of the occupiers and adjacent properties. Policy DC61 of the DPD states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area.

According to Policy CP2, sustainable, attractive, mixed and balanced communities should be created by ensuring that the required sizes and types of new housing are compatible with the prevailing character of the surrounding area and ensuring that in their design and layout, new homes provide for the lifetime of households.

In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, and with regard to the above guidance, the Council requires good design in new housing developments in order to create attractive, safe and secure, high-quality living environments which are sustainable and where people will choose to live.

Staff do not consider the proposal to be compatible with the streetscene given that the prevailing character is of two storey terraced dwellings. The proposal will introduce a bungalow at the end of a cul-de-sac which is out of keeping with the prevailing character of the streetscene.

The proposal is also considered to be out of keeping with the rear garden environment of the properties situated along Straight Road as it would result in a more compact and tighter layout than is the norm in the locality. It would be on a site of restricted area, with greater building site coverage and would have a significantly smaller garden than most other houses in the surrounding area. Due to this, it would be out of character. In addition, in this location, the fact that there would be a sizeable development where none existed previously, would mean that it would erode the open character of this rear garden scene, in which the proposed bungalow would be sited.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The Residential Design SPD states that the provision of amenity space is a key consideration for new residential developments and every home should have access to suitable private and/or communal amenity space through one or more of the following: private gardens, communal gardens, courtyards, patios, balconies and roof terraces. Amenity space is proposed to the rear and front of the property. Staff do not consider the amenity area to the rear to be suitably private as it would only be 8m away from the first floor bedroom window situated to the rear of 70a Straight Road.

Policy DC61 considers that new developments should not materially reduce the degree of privacy enjoyed by the occupants of adjoining properties and should not have an unreasonably adverse effect on sunlight and daylight to adjoining properties.

Staff do not consider the proposal to result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers in terms of overlooking as there are no windows proposed at first floor and any overlooking from the ground floor windows would be restricted by high boundary fences.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

Policy DC33 seeks to ensure all new developments make adequate provision for car parking. The application site falls within an area with a PTAL rating of 1 - 2 which means that the site has low level of accessibility to public transport. PTAL Zone 1-2 anticipates 2-1.5 car parking spaces

for each property. In this instance, 1 no. spaces are proposed. Staff consider the shortfall to be unacceptable as it would result in an overspill of vehicles into Appledore Close to the detriment of Highway safety.

OTHER ISSUES

With regards to refuse collection, similar to other dwellings in the Borough, future occupiers would be required to leave refuse bags close to the highway on collection days. The development in close proximity to Appledore Close and no concerns are therefore raised regarding refuse collection.

Provision for storage of cycles will be conditioned in the event of an approval.

SECTION 106

In accordance with the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document a financial contribution of £6,000 to be used towards infrastructure costs arising from the new development is required. This should be secured through a Unilateral Undertaking in the event that Members are minded to approve the application.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal in its current form would be a cramped development, uncharacteristic in the back garden environment and considered by staff to be harmful to the character of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the amount and quality of amenity space provided is considered to be unacceptable and inadequate facility for off street parking is proposed.

It is therefore considered that the proposal fails to satisfy Policies CP1, CP17, DC2, DC3, DC33, DC61 and DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and a refusal is recommended accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. Reason for refusal - Streetscene

The proposed development would, by reason of its bungalow design and position within the rear garden environment would appear as a visually intrusive feature in the Appledore Close street scene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

2. Reason for refusal - Density/over-development

The proposed development would, by reason of the restricted plot size and positioning of the building close to the boundaries, as well as the limited provision of amenity space, result in a cramped over-development of the site to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers and the character of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

3. Refusal non standard Condition

The proposal, by reason of the location of the amenity space, does not provide for

sufficiently private and usable amenity space, thereby harmful to the privacy and amenity of the future occupiers of the bungalow, contrary to the provisions of the Residential Design SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

4. Refusal non standard condition

The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and contrary to Policies DC2 and DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

5. Reason for Refusal - Planning Obligation

In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.

1 Refusal - No negotiation

Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of NPPF

2 Refusal and CIL (enter amount)

The proposal, if granted planning permission on appeal, would be liable for the Mayor of London Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Based upon the information supplied with the application, the CIL payable would be ££1260. Further details with regard to CIL are available from the Council's website.

APPLICATION NO:	P1381.14	
WARD :	Emerson Park	Date Received: 6th October 2014 Expiry Date: 1st December 2014
ADDRESS:	39 Nelmes Way Hornchurch	
PROPOSAL:	Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a 5 bedroom double storey dwelling house	
DRAWING NO(S):	PL01 PL02 PL06 PL07 PL08 PL09 PL03A PL04A PL05A PL10A	
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the reason(s) given at the end of the report given at the end of the report.	

CALL-IN

This application has been called-in to the Committee by Councillor Ower on the grounds of consistency with other decisions in the area.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to the property at 39 Nelmes Way, Hornchurch. The site is located on the corner of Nelmes Way and Nelmes Crescent and comprises a single storey detached bungalow of approximately 151.5 sqm. The property is set back from both Nelmes Way and Nelmes Crescent, with a garden to the front and sides and a driveway accessed from Nelmes Crescent.

The site lies in an established residential area predominantly comprising 2 storey detached properties.

The site falls within the Emerson Park Policy Area Sector 2 as designated by policy DC69 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing bungalow and erection of a five bedroom two storey dwelling house of approximately 234sqm with accommodation in the roof and a conservatory on the southern side elevation.

The proposal also comprises a detached out building of 41.8sqm and an outdoor swimming pool in the garden to the south east of the proposed dwelling.

Vehicular access will continue to be from Nelmes Crescent and an additional access point is

proposed on Nelmes Way, creating a driveway through the site to the north west of the proposed dwelling. Three off street parking spaces are proposed.

The proposed dwelling will be brick with a slate hipped roof, with two front dormers. Double entrance doors are proposed with a canopy supported by columns on the front elevation. The proposed conservatory will have a glass roof and bi-folding doors.

It is proposed that the ground floor will contain the kitchen, dining and living area, study, reception room and integrated single garage. The first floor will comprise 4 bedrooms, 3 with en-suite and family bathroom. A home cinema and en-suite bedroom are proposed in the roof.

RELEVANT HISTORY

None

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Notifications were sent to 15 neighbouring properties. One comment was received which raised concerns regarding the obstruction to traffic flow in the area during the construction period and the need to keep this disturbance to a minimum.

The Fire Brigade did not raise an objection to the proposal.

Highways did not raise an objection to the proposal subject to conditions and informatives being attached in event of an approval. The conditions relate to pedestrian visibility splays, vehicular access and vehicle cleansing. The informatives relate to changes to the public highway, highway legislation and temporary use of the public highway.

Public protection did not raise an objection to the proposal subject to a condition relating to noise being attached in the event of an approval.

Environmental Protection did not raise an objection to the proposal but recommends conditions relating to contaminated land be attached in the event of an approval.

The London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority did not raise an objection to the proposal but observed that a pump appliance should be able to approach to within 45m of all points within the dwelling.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

- CP17 - Design
- CP2 - Sustainable Communities
- DC11 - Non-Designated Sites
- DC2 - Housing Mix and Density
- DC3 - Housing Design and Layout
- DC33 - Car Parking
- DC35 - Cycling
- DC61 - Urban Design
- DC63 - Delivering Safer Places
- DC69 - Other Areas of Special Townscape or Landscape Character
- DC7 - Lifetime Homes and Mobility Housing
- SPD4 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

LDF

SPD5 - Emerson Park Policy Area SPD

SPD9 - Residential Design SPD

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 3.4 - Optimising housing potential

LONDON PLAN - 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments

LONDON PLAN - 3.8 - Housing choice

LONDON PLAN - 5.12 - Flood risk management

LONDON PLAN - 6.13 - Parking

LONDON PLAN - 6.9 - Cycling

LONDON PLAN - 7.1 - Building London's neighbourhoods and communities

LONDON PLAN - 7.3 - Designing out crime

LONDON PLAN - 7.4 - Local character

LONDON PLAN - 8.3 - Community infrastructure Levy

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed development is liable for the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in accordance with London Plan Policy 8.3. Havering's Mayoral CIL rate is £20 per sqm. The applicable fee is based on the net additional gross internal floorspace.

The proposed new dwelling will create a total gross internal floorspace of 535sqm and will result in the demolition of 133sqm of existing gross internal floorspace. This equates to a net additional gross floorspace of 402sqm (535sqm -133sqm)and a Mayoral CIL payment of £8040.00 (402sqm x £20).

STAFF COMMENTS

The main considerations relate to the site layout, the impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and wider character of the Emerson Park Policy Area and the implications for the residential amenity of the future occupants and of neighbouring properties.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Policy CP1 indicates that outside town centres and the Green Belt, priority will be made on all non-specifically designated land for housing. The continued use of the site for residential purposes is therefore acceptable in principle and in accordance with Policy CP1.

The application site lies within the Emerson Park Policy Area. As such, any development is expected to retain the character of the area typified by a generous level of landscaping. Development will not be permitted unless its massing and architectural character and the resultant spaces between buildings are compatible with the character of the local street scene.

More specifically the development site lies within Sector 2 of the Emerson Park Policy Area which contains in the main, medium sized family houses. Development must comprise detached, single family, individually designed dwellings.

In line with the above, the proposal is acceptable in principle, subject to the details also being acceptable.

DENSITY/SITE LAYOUT

London Plan Policy 3.5 sets minimum space standards for new dwellings. The property has a gross internal floorspace of 535sqm which is far in excess of the minimum standards and is considered acceptable.

The Council's Residential Design SPD recommends that every home should have access to suitable private and/or communal amenity space. In designing high quality amenity space, consideration should be given to privacy, outlook, sunlight, trees and planting, materials (including paving), lighting and boundary treatment. All dwellings should have access to amenity space that is not overlooked from the public realm and this space should provide adequate space for day to day uses.

The proposed rear private amenity space will be well in excess of 200sqm and therefore of adequate size for a five bedroom property. The proposed swimming pool is located in the south-eastern corner of the garden and is located in the most private part of the garden, although it will be subject to overlooking from 41 Nelmes Way.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The proposal will result in a dwelling that is significantly larger both in terms of height and footprint than the existing property. The proposed new dwelling will have a footprint of 234sqm, which is 82.5sqm larger than that of the existing property. Whilst there are numerous examples of large properties in Emerson Park, the corner location and extensive front and side garden make this a particularly prominent location.

The proposed new dwelling is of significant scale and mass. The footprint is both wider and deeper than the dwelling it replaces and the building is substantially higher than the existing bungalow, at approximately 8.3m high to ridge. The overall scale, bulk and width of the property is considered to be such that it will have an overly intrusive and dominating impact on the street scene of Nelmes Way and Nelmes Crescent. The width of the dwelling is exacerbated by the single storey element to the side of the building and the scale of development increased by the addition of an outbuilding, located forward of the building line of the proposed dwelling in Nelmes Way.

The location of the outbuilding on Nelmes Way, to the front of the dwelling, is considered to be inappropriate due to the negative impact it will have on the street scene.

Officers consider that the proposal would stand out as an overly large and prominent addition in the streetscene at this corner location and relate poorly to the scale of neighbouring development in Nelmes Crescent and have a material adverse impact on the street scene of Nelmes Way and this is considered to be sufficient to justify refusal of planning permission. However, it is noted that the acceptability of the impact on the street scene is a matter of judgment and Members may reach a different view in this respect.

The proposal is of a modern design with brick walls, slate roof tiles and glazed feature on the side elevation. Nelmes Way consists of a varied range of residential design and styles and as such the modern design is acceptable.

The front building line of the proposed dwelling would be in-keeping with other properties on Nelmes Way although the dwelling would project well to the front and rear of the adjacent property in Nelmes Crescent, albeit without any significant detrimental impact upon amenity.

With regards to the front boundary treatment, Nelmes Way is characterised by similar types of

front boundary treatment ranging from 1 to 2 m in height consisting of brick walls, railings and sliding and outward/inward opening gates. The proposal reflects what is elsewhere in the street and is considered acceptable.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Policy DC61 considers that new developments should not materially reduce the degree of privacy enjoyed by the occupants of adjoining properties and should not have an unreasonably adverse impact.

There would be no significant adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining dwellings. Whilst the building would be much more visible and appear closer, the proposed siting on the plot would accommodate the extended building without any significant adverse impacts. There would be no overlooking issues and given the separation the new dwelling would not appear overbearing from the nearest residential properties. Therefore, the proposals would be in accordance with Policy DC61 in terms of impact on amenity.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

Provision is made for 3 parking spaces for the proposed new dwelling. This is above the standards set out in Policy DC2 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

No details have been provided of cycle parking provision, however this could be secured by condition.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

Having regard to all relevant factors and material planning considerations officers are of the view that this proposal would not be acceptable.

Officers are of the view that due to the scale and massing of the proposed dwelling this will create an intrusive and prominent structure resulting in a material harm to the street scene

The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy and it is recommended that planning permission is refused.

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. Reason for refusal - Streetscene

The proposed development would, by reason of its height, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

1 Refusal - No negotiation

Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than

negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

APPLICATION NO:	P1540.14	
WARD :	Upminster	Date Received: 5th November 2014 Expiry Date: 31st December 2014
ADDRESS:	Park Corner Farm Park Farm Road Upminster	
PROPOSAL:	Demolition of existing conservatory and replace with a two storey rear extension Revised Plans Received 05.12.2014	
DRAWING NO(S):	101-01 101-02 101-03 101-04 101-03 showing volume calculations 101-04 showing volume calculations Photocopy of article titled 'Hacton in the 1920s' by Peter Hills	
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report given at the end of the report.	

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is located on the northern side of Park Farm Road, at its junction with Hacton Lane and Berwick Pond Road. The residential curtilage of the site is some 100m away from this junction. The residential curtilage consists of one two-storey dwellinghouse with a single storey rear conservatory, which is some 17m from the Park Farm Road boundary. There are also four outbuildings associated with the dwelling on site.

The subject dwellinghouse is isolated from other dwellinghouses, as the closest one is some 130m west of the site on Hacton Lane. There are a number of farm buildings adjacent to the application site within neighbouring properties, including a large heritage barn which is to the north-east of the site, and another large barn to the south-east of the site adjacent to the Park Farm Road boundary. The application site is located within the green belt.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The application proposes to remove the existing rear conservatory at ground floor level and erect a part one, and part two storey rear extension with balcony and double gabled roof.

The ground floor extension would measure between 5.25m to 6.15m deep, and 11.7m wide, whilst the first floor extension would be between 3.2m to 4.1m deep by 11.7m wide. The extension including the new roof space would have a total volume of 353 cubic metres.

RELEVANT HISTORY

There is no planning history on site which is relevant to the subject application.

According to the applicant, the original farm house for Park Corner Farm was located further north-east of the application site, closer to the heritage barn as previously mentioned. The original farm house was bomb damaged and a subsequent new farm house was built in the

current form in its current location in the 1950s.

Building Regulation records verify the form and extent of the building as it currently exists.

P0814.14 - Extension to existing 25m high lattice tower to 28.5m and associated works
Apprv with cons 07-10-2014

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

The proposal was advertised by way of a site notice and in the local press as development which is contrary to the Metropolitan Green Belt Policies of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

Four neighbouring occupiers were consulted. No letters of representation were received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

Policies CP14 (Green Belt), CP17 (Design), DC33 (Car Parking), DC45 (Green Belt) and DC61 (Urban Design) of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Plan Document are considered material, together with the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

Policies 6.13 (parking), 7.4 (local character) and 7.16 (green belt) of the London Plan 2011 are relevant.

Chapters 7 (Requiring good design) and 9 (Protecting Green Belt land) of the National Planning Policy Framework are relevant.

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed extensions have a gross internal floor area of 57 square metres and as such, are not liable for Mayoral CIL.

STAFF COMMENTS

The subject application is brought forward to the Regulatory Services Committee as it is partially inconsistent with Policy DC45 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD, adopted 2008. More specifically, the proposed extensions would result in the finished building exceeding 50% of the cubic capacity of the original dwelling.

For purposes of this application, the existing dwelling on site is considered to be the 'original' dwelling on the basis that the original farm house no longer exists, and there are no plans and documents to verify its form.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The application site falls within the Metropolitan Green Belt.

Chapter 9 of the NPPF states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. An exception to this is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Subject to any extensions being proportionate therefore, this form of development can be acceptable in principle.

Where extensions are considered to be disproportionate and therefore inappropriate, such applications should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The NPPF advises

that Local Planning Authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the green belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

In this case, the use of the proposed development is considered to be appropriate as it is a residential domestic extension to an existing dwelling and is not creating a change of use in the Green Belt. The proposed extension is also considered to be acceptable as it is proportionate to the host dwelling and attempts to replicate the double-gabled form of the original farm house on site before it was bomb damaged, whilst also largely retaining the form of the host dwelling.

GREEN BELT IMPLICATIONS

As indicated above, the NPPF states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. An exception to this is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

The volume of the existing dwelling (minus the rear conservatory as this was a later addition) is 495 cubic metres, whilst the volume of the proposed addition is 353 cubic metres, which constitutes an increase of 71%. Although this is not consistent with Policy DC45, it is considered to be acceptable in this case given the site circumstances.

The proposal would not have an adverse impact on the perception of openness in the area, as it would not significantly alter its relationship with surrounding buildings. The closest point of the rear extension would be some 7.5m from the closest outbuilding, whereas the existing rear wall is also some 7.5m away from the same outbuilding. Although the extension may be visible from certain vantage points along Park Farm Road and Hacton Lane, it would not have a dominating impact on the streetscene or affect the perception of distance to other buildings. The extension is located to the rear of the dwelling and would largely be screened by the existing boundary treatment and windbreaker vegetation on the application site and neighbouring sites.

It is acknowledged that the subject dwelling is located amongst a cluster of other buildings including domestic and non-domestic outbuildings of various sizes, the proposal is not of an extent to alter the massing hierarchy between the surrounding buildings, especially when viewed against the backdrop of the large barns (located within the neighbouring property to the east). The proposal represents very limited infilling of an existing development rather than redeveloping it, and is not of an extent to visually merge the subject cluster of buildings to the next cluster (which is located over 130m to the west).

On this basis, it is considered that the proposed extension would not have an unacceptable impact on the open nature and character of the Green Belt in terms of its massing. Overall, Staff consider that the proposed extension would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and although contrary to Policy DC45 as it would in excess of 50%, does not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt when assessed against Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Policy DC61 states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area. Development must therefore respond to distinctive local building forms and patterns of development and respect the scale, massing and height of the surrounding physical context.

The proposed extension will not have a significant detrimental impact on the streetscene given it would be located to the rear of the host dwelling. The extension may be visible from some vantage points along Hacton Lane or Park Farm Road, however, its visual impact will be minimised by its physical separation from these boundaries, as well as its largely unchanged relationships with neighbouring buildings. Furthermore, the existing landscaping along the boundaries of the application site and neighbouring sites will further soften the proposal's visual impact to an extent where it would be de minimus.

The subject dwelling is well-isolated from other buildings of a similar scale (the closest being a large barn to the south-east some 30m away), and the proposed extension will not change its relationship with these buildings. The application site is very large, and the extension will not appear to be closer to any boundaries than existing due to the vastness of the site.

The proposal would not significantly alter the general form of the dwelling as it would still be a two-storey detached house. The proposed extension is to the rear of the dwelling and will not alter its width or height. The first floor extension will be stepped back from the ground floor extension, which replicates the existing relationship between the original dwelling and the existing rear conservatory. The twin gabled roof helps reduce the visual impact of the extension by shifting the visual focal point towards the centre of the roof and away from the side walls.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be appropriate and will not have a detrimental impact on the streetscene or the character of the surrounding area. This is consistent with Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

As previously discussed, the proposal is well-isolated from neighbouring residential buildings, with the closest being over 130m to the east, off Hacton Lane. On this basis, the proposed development will have no impact on these properties in terms of overlooking, noise and disturbance, or shadowing and dominance.

The proposal is considered to be well-designed, with small high opening flank windows to avoid overlooking into any neighbouring property. It is noted that there would be a large balcony at first floor level which is some 23sqm in area. However, as previously discussed, the subject dwelling is isolated from other residential properties, and the terrace is facing the rear, which is towards the application site, and its view will be partially obstructed by an existing Weeping Willow tree.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The proposal would have no impact on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network as there are no proposed changes to any parking areas or vehicle accesses.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is considered to be appropriate due to its proportion to the host dwelling, without fundamentally altering its form. The host dwelling has sufficient physical separation from other buildings of a similar scale so the proposal would not unbalance the setting of the built form in the area. The proposed extension is located to the rear of the dwelling and its visual impact will be softened by the boundary screening and on-site landscaping of the application site as well as neighbouring sites.

On this basis, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the integrity of the greenbelt,

nor would it have an adverse impact on the streetscene or the character of the area. The proposal would not affect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

The proposed development is considered to be consistent with relevant policy and guidance and it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accord with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

3. SC10 (Matching materials)

All new external finishes shall be carried out in materials to match those of the existing building(s) to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

4. SC62 (Hours of construction)

All building operations in connection with the construction of external walls, roof, and foundations; site excavation or other external site works; works involving the use of plant or machinery; the erection of scaffolding; the delivery of materials; the removal of materials and spoil from the site, and the playing of amplified music shall only take place between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00am and 1.00pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays/Public Holidays.

INFORMATIVES

1 Standard Green Belt Informative

The application property is within the Metropolitan Green Belt where there are restrictions over development. In view of those extensions which have already taken place and/or been granted permission, it should not be assumed that further extensions will be agreed.

2 Approval - No negotiation required

Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.