

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

APPLICATION NO:	P0257.12	
WARD :	St Andrew's	Date Received: 27th February 2012
ADDRESS:	Land Rear of 182-200 High Street Hornchurch	
PROPOSAL:	Demolition of existing building and garages, construction of new building consisting of 2No. B1 units and 5No. 1 bedroom flats and of street parking for 6 No. cars and amenity space revised plans received 2/5	
DRAWING NO(S):	2366_3_PL01; -PL02; -PL02A; -PL03A; -PL04A; _PL05A; _PL06; -PL07_1; - PL07_2; topographic survey	
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions given at the end of the report.	

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site located to the rear of the existing shops/residential properties and fronting High Street, Hornchurch comprises a building located to the Eastern and southern boundary used previously as a garage for the repair of motor vehicles with garages/lock-ups to the rear (southern boundary) and hardstanding otherwise. The wall to the southern boundary of the application site is just under 3.3m high with the part adjacent to the commercial unit being 3.8m high. Access to the site is via a shared service road connecting to High Street to the east/north of the application site. The site is within the Hornchurch Major District Centre. The site area is 0.176 Acres.

The surrounding area is a mixture of buildings and uses with two- and three-storey commercial/residential properties to the north and west fronting onto High Street and Station Road, a swimming pool sales building to the east with Lodge Court (2-storey residential accommodation) further east and to the south are two-storey residential properties fronting onto Mavis Grove.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing building and garages and the erection of a single building to provide two B1 Uses to the ground floor with four flats at first floor level and a fifth flat provided in the roof space.

The building would be located across the site on a generally East-West orientation with the two end sections projecting to the southern boundary. The building would be set back from the access way by approximately 11.5m (in part due to the existing electricity sub-station) and would have a maximum width of 33.5m with section depths of 10.7m, 7.8m and 13.4m (from west to east) and a mansard-style roof with a maximum ridge height of 8.15m. The nearest part of each section of the building to the southern boundary would be 3.7m, 9.3m and 0.5m(min.) (from west to east).

There would be an area of communal amenity space to the rear (south) of the building of 290 sq.m. There would also be a single balcony/terrace at first floor to Flat 4 of 23 sq.m. Each B1 use would have a separate outside area: the western B1 unit s area would be provided to the rear whilst the eastern B1 Unit would have a narrow strip around the building with a small covered area to the north adjacent to its entrance.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

It is proposed to provide 6 parking spaces; 5 of which would be provided in an under-croft.

The main differences between this proposal and the previously refused schemes - P1041.09 (also dismissed on appeal) and P1563.09 - are:

- reduction from 9/8 residential units to 5 units
- introduction of commercial uses at ground floor level
- relocating the building further away from the southern boundary
- reduction in the height/bulk of the proposed building
- relocation of vehicle parking to the front of the application site

RELEVANT HISTORY

P1041.09 - Redevelopment of the site with a two storey flatted block to form 9 units consisting of 5x1beds and 4x2beds and parking spaces - refused 02-10-09; subsequent appeal dismissed 30-06-2010

P1563.09 - Demolition of existing buildings and garages and construction of new building consisting of 8 units (6x1 bed and 2x2-bed) and off street parking for 8 cars and amenity space - Refused 11-01-2010

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

82 neighbouring occupiers were notified of the proposal. There have been 4 pieces of correspondence objecting on the following grounds:

- insufficient parking for both proposed and existing flat dwellers and their visitors
- the access to High Street is unsuitable for Emergency Vehicles/Service Vehicles
- Changing the width of the access road to two-way would reduce parking available for existing occupiers, particularly from the access itself
- Overlooking of gardens and houses

Thames Water have written to advise that they have no objection with regard to waste providing that storm flows are attenuated/regulated through on or off site storage and that site drainage should be separate.

Essex and Suffolk Water have no objections regarding water supply.

The Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor has written to advise that the site's location is in an area of higher than the Havering average crime levels. He requests the addition of a condition and informative regarding Secured by Design and ones for external lighting and details of cycle storage if permission is granted.

English Heritage indicate that the site is within an Archaeological Priority Area and that it is likely that there are archaeological remains including from the original village and the industrial period when Hornchurch Brewery was located at the application site. They request a condition and informative are attached to any grant of planning permission.

The Fire Brigade (LFEDA) previously indicated that access should meet 16.3 of ADB Volume 2 but if this cannot be achieved a fire main should be provided in accordance with 15.3 and access meet 16.6. These are the Building Regulations documents and a separate Buildings Regulations application would be needed.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

RELEVANT POLICIES

Policies CP1, CP2, CP9, CP10, CP15, CP17, DC2, DC3, DC11, DC12, DC16, DC24, DC33, DC34, DC35, DC36, DC53, DC55, DC61, DC62, DC63 and DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

The SPD on Residential Extensions and Alterations (as relevant), SPD on Residential Design, SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction and draft SPD on Planning Obligations.

London Plan Policies 2.15 (town centres), 3.3 (Increasing London's Supply of Housing), 3.5, 3.8, 3.9, 4.2, 4.3 (mixed use development and offices), 4.7, 6.9, 6.13, 7.3, 7.4 and 7.6, as well as the NPPF are applicable.

STAFF COMMENTS

The issues arising from this application are the principle of development, the impact on local character, density and site layout, the impact on amenity and parking and highway issues.

BACKGROUND

The reasons for refusal of the P1563.09 8-flat scheme are:

1. The proposed development would, by reason of its poor design, bulk and massing, appear as a visually intrusive and overly dominant feature in this backland location, harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.
2. The proposal would, by reason of noise and disturbance and light overspill caused by users of the rear access road as well as prospective occupiers entering and leaving the site, vehicles parking and manoeuvring, particularly during the evening hours, be unacceptably detrimental to the amenities of prospective occupiers of the development, contrary to Policy DC55 and DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies DPD.

In relation to the appeal for P1041.09 which was decided after the later scheme was refused, the Planning Inspector considered that the 9 flat scheme was not acceptable:

- "Due to the poor outlook, inadequate amenity space, and the likelihood of significant noise and disturbance, I conclude that the proposal would not provide satisfactory living conditions for future residents and would fail to comply with policy DC61 of the Core Strategy."
- "I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would not comply with Core Strategy policies DC2, DC61 or the guidance in PPS3."

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Policy CP1 indicates that housing will be the preferred use of non-designated sites. The site is located within the Hornchurch Major District Centre where Policy DC16 promotes retail uses and a degree of service uses. The policy however does not specifically refer to redevelopment of vacant or brownfield land.

The site does border a residential area to the south and there are flats to the upper floors of ground floor commercial uses along High Street/Station Road. The principle of mixed use development with B1 Uses (offices, research and development, light industrial) below new housing development therefore accords in principle with Policy CP1 and Policy DC11 and would be acceptable in principle in relation to The London Plan Policies 4.3 (mixed use) and 4.7 (town centre development), subject to acceptable design and layout.

DENSITY/SITE LAYOUT

The proposal is to provide two B1 uses and 5 residential units, each with 1 bedroom. The

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

application site area is 0.0176 ha and therefore the density would be approximately 56 units per hectare. Policy DC2 indicates that in this location, the range would be 50-110 units per hectare and this proposal would be at the lower end of this range. However the proposal also includes two B1 uses to the ground floor and the main consideration is whether the scheme is of a high standard of design and layout in accordance with Policies DC2 and DC61.

The London Plan indicates at Policy 3.5 (and Table 3.3) that 1-bed units for 2 people should be a minimum of 50 sq.m (gross internal area). The minimum proposed flat size would be 50.5sq.m (Flat 4) which means that all 5 flats would be in excess of the minimum internal space standards.

In respect of the site layout, the vehicular access is to the north and access to the site and the car parking spaces is drawn from the northern boundary of the site. The amenity area would be provided to the rear adjoining the amenity areas of the adjoining residential properties. It is considered that this layout would be acceptable.

Staff therefore consider that the proposal would therefore accord with Policy DC2, DC61 and the Residential design SPD and London Plan.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The proposal would be on two-storeys with a mansard-style roof with accommodation of one flat within the roofspace; the remaining roofspace being void. There is a three-storey terrace with shops to the ground floor and mainly residential accommodation above to High Street and to the rear are 2-storey dwellings. It is considered that the proposed building would represent a stepping down from the three-storey development to the north and, as such would not be out of character with existing development in the town centre and beyond into the mainly residential area to the south.

In terms of impact in the street, given the backland development proposed and lack of any obvious building lines along this stretch of land, no material impact on a pattern of development would occur. Although the scheme would introduce a new development on a previously mainly open site, it would have minimal impact on the appearance of the streetscene. This is due to the fact that the development would not be visible from High Street and there would be limited views afforded to the site from Mavis Grove to the south, mainly due to the existing high rear wall which is to be retained. It is also considered that the building would be sufficiently set back from the existing access road and would not appear overly dominant and obtrusive along this frontage.

The proposed development would be located a minimum of 43m from houses to the south of the application site. Staff consider that while a section of the proposed building would be located less than 1m from the boundary, that the main section of the building would be located over 9m from the boundary and that due to the distances involved and the higher than normal height of the separating wall at 3.8m high and that the existing building which lies adjacent to the boundary is 6m high to its ridge (3.3m to eaves level), that there would be no significant undue impact on the rear garden environment of these existing dwellings. While there are no gardens associated with the flatted development to the north, there is rear access and, again due to the separating distances involved Staff consider that any amenity which the flat dwellers derive would not be adversely affected by the proposed building.

Staff therefore consider that the design and siting of the proposed block, given its location at the rear of a three-storey building and within this backland site, would not appear materially obtrusive in the street scene, nor would it have an adverse impact on the rear garden environment. It would be a large feature on this site, nonetheless Staff consider that it would not

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

result in it being overbearing or intrusive.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The development is proposed to be located to the north of the properties on Mavis Grove at an average distance of some 40m. The southern elevation as well as the other elevations which face inwards onto the rear amenity area each have at least one Juliette balcony. However, given the distances/oblique angles involved and the height of the retained rear wall at a minimum of 3.3m/max 3.8m, Staff do not consider that the proposal would result in any loss of light or unacceptable levels of overlooking of these existing properties. Additionally, given the existing mature landscaping outside the application site to the south and the three-storey building along High Street, no loss of outlook would occur sufficient to warrant grounds for refusal.

The proposed B1 Uses would replace the existing (former) car servicing/MOT facility which does not appear to have any hours restrictions. Staff consider that the proposed B1 uses would be less intrusive than the existing use and that there would be no adverse impact from this part of the scheme on existing occupiers. A suitable condition can be attached in relation to hours of use, should planning permission be granted.

In relation to the properties along High Street, the proposed building is located to the south of these neighbours which could cause loss of southerly and easterly light. However, staff consider that there would be sufficient separation distance (22m) between the application site and these properties which are located at first floor and above, and would therefore not cause any unacceptable loss of light.

In relation to the amenities of the proposed occupiers of this backland site, Staff consider that B1 Uses within the 2 ground floor units would be acceptable within a residential area; nonetheless given the close proximity of the residential units directly above these commercial units and that this is a town centre location that the B1 use should be restricted such that they are not used for light industrial purposes and that the hours of use are restricted. Anyone buying a flat within the town centre would need to take into account that at this site it would be in close proximity to the ground floor business uses which front onto High Street, with cars passing within the rear service road and large parking areas close to the proposed building and that the access road would be used not only by the occupiers but by all those servicing the business properties. It is considered that suitable sound insulation to the flats would help ameliorate noise and other disturbance for the future occupants.

While the outlook from north facing windows would be of the rear servicing areas and rear access to the shops/flats fronting onto High Street, the main outlook for the proposed flats including the roof flat (Flat 5) with its near vertical hanging velux windows, would be to the rear onto the amenity area. Staff consider that the new occupiers would have a general level of amenity derived from this outlook and would also all have access to the communal amenity area (even if not directly) with flat 4 benefiting from a large north-facing balcony/terrace.

Staff therefore consider that the proposed development would result in an acceptable level of amenity for the new occupiers whilst not affecting existing residential amenity to an unacceptable degree.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The car parking requirements for developments in this location is 1.5 to 1 parking spaces per residential unit. The proposed development would have 5 parking spaces for the 5 flats. It is considered that the provision of one space per unit in this instance would be justifiable,

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

particularly in view of the site's location within the town centre with a number of public car-parks and the nature of units proposed, which comprise smaller households.

In relation to the proposed B1 Units car parking provision would be expected to be 1 space per 100 sq.m. In this case, 2 spaces. A single space would be provided. Highways have indicated that 7 spaces should be provided with one for each unit. Nonetheless given the town centre location Staff consider that the provision of 6 spaces overall with some overlap of use (mainly day-time for the commercial uses and evenings/weekends for the residential uses) would not result in any adverse impact on highway safety.

In respect of access, the proposed development would take access off the High Street frontage, which would be shared with the existing commercial and residential traffic in the area, to which no objection is raised by Streetcare staff, although an observation is made that the Borough's refuse vehicles currently service the flats above shops of 182-200 High Street from the access road. The plans indicate a shared bin store would be provided. While Highways have asked for the bin store to be relocated to enable easier access for waste collection teams, the current arrangement would have a locked gate such that arrangements would be needed for occupiers to put their waste out on collection day. Details would need to be submitted and a suitable condition can be attached to any grant of planning permission.

The London Fire Brigade previously raised no objections to the means of access to the site for emergency vehicles, despite the reduced width of the access. It would appear that sufficient space is maintained adjacent to the electricity sub-station for access by EDF Energy and the proposed building is no closer than the existing vacant car repairs centre.

Although the development would result in an increase in traffic in this part of the town centre, no concerns are raised regarding congestion or overspill car parking. It is therefore not considered that the development would lead to pedestrian or highway safety concerns.

In line with Annex 6, cycle parking provision is made on site and would be subject to a suitable planning condition for its implementation and retention.

OTHER ISSUES

The Secured by Design Officer has requested the inclusion of a suitable condition in relation to secured by design.

The site lies in an Archaeological Priority Area and a suitable condition to enable investigation of possible archaeology would be attached to any grant of planning permission.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is for 2 B1 Units and 5 self-contained flats within Hornchurch Town Centre. Staff consider that the proposal would be acceptable in principle and that the details of the scheme are acceptable such that this would overcome the reasons for refusing the previous schemes, in accordance with Policies DC2, DC33, DC36 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to conditions

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

2. SC09 (Materials) (Pre Commencement Condition)
3. SC32 (Accordance with plans)
4. SC58 (Storage of refuse)
5. SC77 (Archaeological investigation) (Pre Commencement)
6. SC78 (Secure by Design) (Pre Commencement)
7. SC11 (Landscaping) (Pre Commencement Condition)
8. SC19 (Restricted use) ENTER DETAILS

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 the use hereby permitted shall be Class B1a (offices) and B1b (research and development) only and shall be used for no other purpose(s) whatsoever including any other use in Class B1 including B1c (light industrial) of the Order, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To restrict the use of the premises to one compatible with the surrounding area and to enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over any future use not forming part of this application, and that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policies DC11 and DC61.

9. SC34A (Obscure and fixed glazing)

The proposed windows to Flat 1 and Flat 5's flank elevations shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass and thereafter be maintained and permanently fixed shut to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

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

10. SC60 (Contaminated land condition No. 1) (Pre Commencement)

11. Non Standard Condition 33

The B1 Uses shall not operate except between 08:00 and 18:00 on Mondays to Saturdays and not at all on Sundays, Bank and Public Holidays without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To protect residential amenity in accordance with Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

12. Non Standard Condition 31

Prior to completion of the works hereby permitted, the cycle storage shall be provided and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of providing a wide range of facilities for non-motor car residents, in the interests of sustainability.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

13. Non Standard Condition 32

Prior to completion of the works hereby permitted, details of external lighting which shall have previously been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be provided and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and public safety in accordance with Policies DC61 and DC63 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

1 Reason for Approval

The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the aims, objectives and provisions of Policies CP17, DC2, DC3, DC11, DC12, DC16, DC24, DC33, DC34, DC35, DC36, DC53, DC55, DC61, DC62, DC63 and DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

Note: Following a change in government legislation a fee is now required when submitting details pursuant to the discharge of conditions, in order to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications and Deemed Applications) (Amendment) (England) Regulations, which came into force from 06.04.2008. A fee of £85 per request (or £25 where the related permission was for extending or altering a dwellinghouse) is needed.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

APPLICATION NO:	P0427.12	
WARD :	Hylands	Date Received: 3rd April 2012
ADDRESS:	28 Harrow Drive Hornchurch	
PROPOSAL:	Single and two storey rear extensions, single storey front extension	
DRAWING NO(S):	P.01 P.02 P.03 Rev A P.04 P.05 P.06 P.07 P.08	
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions given at the end of the report.	

CALL-IN

The application has been called in by Councillor Galpin as she considers the proposal raises neighbourliness and streetscene issues.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject dwelling is a substantial and previously extended detached house on the east side of Harrow Drive. There is an attached double garage located on the northern side of the dwelling and ample off-street parking available at the property. The surrounding area comprises mixed residential properties and the land is fairly level. No trees will be affected by the development.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a single storey front extension and single and two storey rear extensions.

In the front facade an extension will be constructed to provide an extended hall and wc which will be 1.9m deep for a width of 3.1m and will then step back 300mm and extend a further 1.970m. It will have a gabled roof 3.8m high.

On the left hand side of the property (north), a single storey rear extension is proposed which will step in 400mm from the existing flank wall at the rear of the existing garage (with study beyond) for a depth of 3.10m and width of 5.210m and will then step back 2.450m for a width of 12.430m.

This will result in this element being 3.10m deeper than the existing projection on the left hand side of the property (north) and 3.80m deeper in the centre with the existing projection on the right hand side (south) 1.690m deeper. A hipped roof will be provided on the northern side and a mono-pitched roof will be provided over to the rest.

At the rear at first floor level on the left hand (northern) side of the property, a 3.80m deep by 4.150m wide extension is proposed and on the southern side a 3.0m deep by 4.150m extension is also proposed. Hipped roofs 8m high will be provided over both first floor extensions.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

The proposed development will provide no additional bedrooms.

RELEVANT HISTORY

Building Control records are copied below:

1841/54 - Private garage
8666/78 - Kitchen modification and new cloakroom
7307/85 - Rear extension

Available planning history:

L/HAV/1539/87 - Two storey side extension and garage - Approved
P0151.11 - Two storey side and rear extensions and single storey side extension - Refused
P0911.11 - Single storey front extension, single/two storey, side/rear extensions and single/two storey rear extensions - Refused

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been advertised by the direct notification of surrounding residential properties.

Two letters of objection have been received from two neighbours at the same address and a local Councillor. Their comments are summarised below:

* The writers have objected to both previous applications on broadly similar grounds each time, namely - the impact of the scale, bulk and massing of the proposal on the amenity of adjacent properties and the physical incongruity between the excessive scale of the proposal and its immediate surroundings in the street and rear garden scenes.

Whilst it is acknowledged the application now under consideration represents a variation on the previous schemes, with specific reference to their property, the proposed changes remove none of the previous objections; the proposed extension to the southern side of the rear elevation includes a 3m deep extension at first floor level, identical to the last application; it is noted that the ground floor extension in this location proposes a slightly shorter rearward extension (1.69m as opposed to 1.99m in the last application) but this minimal alteration does not sufficiently help to overcome the impact on their property.

The writers also draw attention to the emphasis that Members placed upon the poor relationship between this element of the proposed extension and their bungalow and the impact such an out of scale scheme would have on the single storey property. Visual impact, bulk and massing were also raised.

Turning to the development on the northern side of the property, it is acknowledged that the proposed extension at first floor level has been reduced in scale, but the ground floor extension (annotated as a kitchen) extends a significant distance into the rear garden (3.10m). Although the overall height will be reduced, height, bulk and massing, complete with the proposed roof design, will still render the proposal inappropriate in respect of the way it negatively impinges on the rear garden environment and how it adversely affects the residential amenity of No.34.

The extension of the rear wall across the entire width of the property will be harmful to the rear garden environment;

The submitted plans are inaccurate in that they seem to delineate the bungalow by utilising the

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

outline of the roof and associated eaves, rather than the actual position of the exterior walls which has the effect of misrepresenting the relative positions of the two properties and also the position of the flank windows in relation to the proposed flank wall of the subject dwelling;

Certain health problems are being experienced by the writers which are being made worse by the stress of the proposed development;

It is also requested that the application be called into Committee for decision and if approved a construction condition attached.

One letter has also been received from a local Councillor objecting to the proposal on the grounds that this resubmission is not unlike the one refused recently at Committee and that the refusal put emphasis on the impact the resultant building would have on the character, and local environment and the bungalow at No.24;

The Councillor goes on to say that the plans are incorrect insofar as the position of the windows in the bungalow property are concerned. The proposed development continues to be out of character and over-development for the site.

RELEVANT POLICIES

Policies DC33 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.
Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

STAFF COMMENTS

A previous application, reference P0151.11, was refused planning permission on 31st March 2011 under Delegated Powers. It was considered the proposed development would, by reason of its height, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street and rear garden scene, harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area and also that it would, by reason of its excessive depth, height and position close to the boundaries of the site, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development, as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers.

A subsequent application, reference P0911.11 -

- * altered the gabled roof at first floor level on the northern side to a hip;
- * provided a 1m separation from the northern boundary instead of about 600mm;
- * reduced the width of the first floor rear extension in the centre of the property from 6.930m wide to 5.560m.
- * reduced the length of the first floor on the southern side from 4.090m to 3m and provided a hipped roof over the single storey element below;

That scheme was considered to be acceptable by officers but was called into Committee by a Councillor for decision. The decision was to refuse planning permission for the same reasons as before.

The application now under consideration has reduced the scale of development again in the following ways:

- * Apart from the addition of a new front porch, the property will not appear altered from existing when viewed from the front streetscene;

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

- * The first floor element on the northern side of the property (above the existing garage) is now deleted;
- * The existing garage will remain as existing (600mm off the northern boundary) with the single storey extension to the rear now being brought 1.0m off the boundary. The depth will remain at 3.100 as in the previous proposal;
- * The depth of the single storey extension at the rear, roughly in the middle of the property, will remain as in the previous application 3.80m.
- * The depth of the single storey rear extension on the southern side will now be 1.690m rather than 1.990m and provided with a mono-pitched roof;
- * At first floor level at the rear the extension closest to the northern boundary will now be 4.150m wide rather than 5.560m. The depth will remain the same 3.86m;
- * The first floor rear extension close to the southern boundary will remain the same (4.150m wide by 3.000m deep).

The acceptability of these changes will be discussed later in the report.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Harrow Drive is an attractive road of very mixed size and design residential properties, with many dwellings being set within generally spacious plots.

The subject dwelling lies on the east side of Harrow Drive, between a two storey house to the north, No.34 and a bungalow to the south, No.24 (note numbering anomaly). The subject dwelling was originally a modest, detached, gabled property with a two storey front projection and a small detached hipped roof building to the side, separated by a small picket gate. It is noted that the property in its original form measured approx 12.7m wide by 5.5m deep with a two storey, front forward projection of 1.3m on the southern side.

Following two recent refusals for substantial additions to this property, the proposal now under consideration, when viewed from the front streetscene, only intends a front porch addition which is considered to relate acceptably to the property. No undue front streetscene issues will now arise.

When viewed in the rear garden environment, it was considered in both the previous applications that the development would have resulted in development that would have appeared bulky, dominating and incongruous, to the detriment of the property itself and the surrounding area.

When viewed from the rear garden environment, the current application differs in that the space above the garage is now maintained, the extension behind the garage has been reduced in width and the larger of the first floor rear elements has been reduced in width from 5.560m to 4.150m.

On balance, staff consider the general bulk of the development in the rear elevation has been reduced sufficiently to overcome previous concerns.

Having regard to the above, Staff consider that the development as revised has addressed previously identified visual impact concerns. The design, bulk and scale of the development is considered acceptable and will not now cause harm to the surrounding area.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Dealing firstly with the bungalow property to the south, No.24, this property has an approximate separation from the party boundary of 1.3m and the proposed development on the southern side

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

of the subject dwelling will be approximately 3.43m further away. It should be noted at this point that this bungalow's rear building line is approximately 800mm deeper into the garden than the subject dwelling would be if extended at ground level and 2.2m than the first floor. This bungalow has two windows in the flank wall facing the subject dwelling and it is noted that submitted plans indicate their positions to be slightly incorrect. Nonetheless, one is an obscure glazed window which serves the bathroom, therefore less weight will be attached to any loss of light and the second window is a secondary source of light to the kitchen. Objection therefore is difficult to substantiate on the grounds of loss of sunlight that may occur to the flank windows of this property.

Although it is accepted the single storey rear extension close to this neighbour has only been reduced in depth by 300mm, the overall bulk of the proposed development has been greatly reduced when viewed from the rear garden area of this neighbour.

Turning now to No.34, this property lies to the north of the subject dwelling and is a two storey dwelling house. Site visit reveals this property is set away from the common boundary by about 5.5m and has a 1.6m high approx screen hedge. It has an attached double garage with a small greenhouse to the rear close to the common boundary. It has no flank windows to be affected by the proposals.

The development on this side is now to only be at single storey level which will be 400mm less wide than the existing garage. Staff consider these changes drastically reduce the bulk of the proposed development and its potential impact upon the patio area and general outlook of this neighbour.

It is noted that a flank window is proposed at ground level facing this neighbour which serves a utility room. In the event of planning permission being granted, a condition is suggested to ensure this window is obscure glazed with top hung fanlight opening only to protect this neighbours' privacy.

Having regard to the above, Staff consider the scheme as revised to have satisfactorily addressed neighbourliness concerns and no objections are raised to this aspect of the development.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

No additional bedrooms will now be provided to the property, and present parking arrangements will remain, therefore no highway issues arise.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

For the reasons discussed above, the proposal is now considered to be in accordance with the above Policies and approval of planning permission is now recommended, subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to conditions

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs
2. SC10 (Matching materials)
3. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

4. SC34B (Obscure with fanlight openings only) ENTER DETAILS

The proposed window in the north facing flank wall that serves the utility room hereby permitted, shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass and with the exception of top hung fanlight(s) shall remain permanently fixed shut 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)

2

The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the aims, objectives and provisions of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

Note: Following a change in government legislation a fee is now required when submitting details pursuant to the discharge of conditions, in order to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications and Deemed Applications) (Amendment) (England) Regulations, which came into force from 06.04.2008. A fee of £85 per request (or £25 where the related permission was for extending or altering a dwellinghouse) is needed.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

APPLICATION NO:	P0432.12	
WARD :	St Andrew's	Date Received: 11th April 2012
ADDRESS:	194 Elm Park Avenue Elm Park	
PROPOSAL:	Change of use from A1 to A3 on ground floor unit including extract equipment	
DRAWING NO(S):		
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions given at the end of the report.	

SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject site comprises a vacant, ground floor retail (A1) unit in a three storey, terraced building in a shopping parade. The parade is located in the retail core of the Elm Park Minor District Centre. The site is surrounded predominantly by town centre uses on the ground floor, and offices or residential units on the upper floors. Immediately adjacent to the subject site is a restaurant and takeaway (A3) at No. 192 and a clothes and outfit hire business (A1) at No. 196. A flat is immediately above the site.

The unit comprises the original ground floor and a single storey rear extension. The most recent use was as an off-licence and the unit has been vacant for approximately 12 months. The site is serviced by an access road to the rear of the parade. Public car parking facilities are located approximately 70m away and Elm Park Underground Station is located approximately 150m away from the site.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The proposal comprises the change of use of the vacant unit from A1 to a restaurant, Use Class A3. The restaurant would seat approximately 20 people and would employ up to 6 members of staff. The opening hours would be from 9am-9pm Monday to Saturday and 11am-5pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays. The unit would be used as a Pie and Mash shop.

The only external alteration would be the installation of an extraction unit to the single storey rear extension. The extension projects 10m rearward from the facade of the three storey building and the duct would protrude from its end elevation before returning upwards.

RELEVANT HISTORY

No relevant history

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbouring occupiers were directly notified of the application; four responses were received. Two letters were from local restaurant owners, concerned about the impact another restaurant in the vicinity would have on their business. Staff note that this is not a material planning consideration.

The third response contained concerns about the anti-social behaviour that another takeaway in the area would potentially bring. It is noted that the application is for a restaurant, not a takeaway, which would come under Use Class A5. The Crime Prevention Design Advisor has

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

been consulted on the proposal, and has no objections or issues relating to the application.

The fourth response raises concerns regarding odour emissions and potential noise from the extractor unit. The respondent is also concerned about noise impacts of early or late deliveries and would like to restrict parking in the residential area.

Environmental Health has also been consulted on the proposal. The response requires the addition of conditions, should planning permission be granted, requiring the control of odour and noise. An informative should also be added regarding guidance on the discharge of the odour condition and reminding the applicant that all food premises should be registered with Environmental Health.

The Highway Authority were also consulted and had no objection to the proposal as a pay and display car park is located nearby for the use of potential customers.

RELEVANT POLICIES

DC16, DC33, DC36, DC55, DC61 - LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The site is located within the Elm Park Minor District Centre Retail Core. Policy DC16 indicates that the change of use from A1 to a service use (A2, A3, A4, A5) would be acceptable in principle where:

- (a) the use provides a service appropriate to a shopping area
- (b) the proposal will not result in the grouping of 3 or more adjoining A2-A5 uses
- (c) the proposal will not result in the proportion of non-retail uses within the relevant frontage exceeding 33% of its total length.

The proposed use would provide a service appropriate to a shopping area. The use would contain an active frontage, and would be open during the core shopping hours. The proposal would also not result in the grouping of 3 or more adjoining A2-A5 units as No. 196 has an A1 use. However, it should be noted that the percentage of non-retail uses within the relevant frontage would increase from 27.5% to approximately 42.5%, which would bring the parade over the 33% threshold.

Policy DC16 states that exceptions to the policy may be made where the applicant can demonstrate through 12 months marketing information, that the premises have proved difficult to dispose of for the designated use. A letter has been received from a Readings Property Services confirming that the property has been marketed for over a year and little response has been received. Those enquiries which were received were not followed through by the enquirers.

The proposed use would bring a vacant unit back into use and provide a use which would be open during the day thus creating a footfall. Another unit in the parade, No. 188 is presently vacant. This unit was last used as an A2 use, so there is still the potential for the parade to support further retail uses in the future. On this basis Members may take the view that the proposed use would be appropriate to a shopping area as it would be likely to attract both dedicated customers and those on more general shopping trips. Staff are of the view that the proposal has the potential to make a contribution to pedestrian flows and Members may agree that the proposal would display many similar characteristics to some Class A1 uses in terms of

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

the general level of activity and expenditure, particularly as it is proposed that the A3 use would be open during normal shopping hours and beyond.

Staff consider that this application would potentially benefit the vitality of the parade by bringing a vacant unit back in to use. For these reasons Staff consider that the proposal would be appropriate within this shopping area. Members are invited to exercise their judgement as to whether or not this proposal would be materially harmful to the vitality and viability of this parade within the Major Local Centre, taking into account the extent to which non-retail uses are already present within the parade.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The proposal does not involve any changes to the external appearance of the front of the premises and would therefore not have any impact on the character and appearance of the Elm Park Avenue streetscene.

Towards the rear, the proposal would involve the introduction of an extract duct. The neighbouring property at No. 192 Elm Park Avenue has an A3 use class with an extract duct towards the rear. The rear of the application site consists of an access way to the rear with a few parking spaces, garages, refuse storage areas and access to some of the commercial units on the ground floor and residential units on the upper floors. Given this, it is considered that the extract flue would be acceptable in principle with no adverse impact on the streetscene.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The application site is within the Elm Park Minor District Centre and the area is characterised by commercial uses at ground floor level and a mixture of commercial and residential flats above. The impact on residential properties is of concern when determining a planning application for a change of use. A judgement must be made in each case as to whether there is any likelihood of the proposal resulting in unreasonable noise and disturbance.

Should planning permission be granted for an A3 use, the opening hours would be between 9am and 9pm. Within the vicinity of the application site, being part of a Minor District Centre, a certain level of background noise can be expected within the area. Noise and disturbance to surrounding residents is unlikely to detract from residential amenity over and above the impact of existing background noise generated by activities within the Elm Park District Centre. Restricted hours of use can prevent undue disturbance to neighbouring occupiers, including those living above the application premises. Staff therefore do not consider that the proposed internal use of the application site's floorspace would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

Extraction ducts are not uncommon in Minor District Centre's and it is considered by Staff that with the correct noise and odour reducing measures in place to the satisfaction of Environmental Health, the extract duct would be acceptable and would not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Consequently, subject to conditions, no material harm to amenity is considered to result and the proposal is compliant with Policies DC16 and DC61.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The proposal makes no provision for off-street parking for customers, but the site is within the Elm Park Minor District Centre, which is well served by public transport and public car parks.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

Servicing can be safely carried out via the access road to the rear of the premises. No objections have been received by the Highways Authority. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not be likely to adversely affect the highway, road safety or amenity.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal does conflict with Policy DC16 as it would result in the frontage consisting of over 33% non-retail uses. However, the premises have been unsuccessfully marketed as a retail unit for over a year, and under those circumstances, DC16 does allow some flexibility. The proposed use would be suitable for a Minor District Centre and staff consider there is merit in bringing the unit back into use, to contribute to the vitality and viability of the centre.

The change of use application does not involve any changes to the external appearance of the building apart from the extraction flue to the rear of the property. It is not considered that this part of the proposal would have any impact in terms of its visual appearance on the street scene.

It is not considered that the proposal would have any unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties within this location and any potential impact can be restricted with appropriate conditions.

Having regard to all relevant factors and material planning considerations Staff are of the view that this is an acceptable use in this location. Staff are of the view that the proposal would not be harmful to the vitality and viability of this part of this Minor District Centre and it is recommended that planning permission is granted, subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to conditions

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

2. SC27 (Hours of use) ENTER DETAILS

The premises shall not be used for the purposes hereby permitted other than between the hours of 9am and 9pm on Mondays to Saturdays and between 11am and 5pm on Sundays and Bank or Public holidays without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control in the interests of amenity, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

3. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

4. SC58 (Storage of refuse)

5. Non Standard Condition 1 (Pre Commencement Condition)

Before the use commences, the building shall be insulated in accordance with a scheme which shall previously have been approved by the Local Planning Authority in order to secure a reduction in the level of noise emanating from the building.

Reason: To prevent noise nuisance to adjoining properties in accordance with the

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

recommendations of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. Non Standard Condition 2 (Pre Commencement Condition)

Before any works commence a scheme for any new plant or machinery shall be submitted to the local planning authority to achieve the following standard. Noise levels expressed as the equivalent continuous sound level LAeq (1 hour) when calculated at the boundary with the nearest noise sensitive premises shall not exceed LA90 -10dB and shall be maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent noise nuisance to adjoining properties in accordance with the recommendations of Planning Policy Guidance Note 24 Planning & Noise 1994.

7. Non Standard Condition 3 (Pre Commencement Condition)

Before the use commences suitable equipment to remove and/or disperse dours and odorous material should be fitted to the extract ventilation system in accordance with a scheme to be designed and certified by a competent engineer and after installation a certificate to be lodged with the Planning Authority. Thereafter, the equipment shall be properly maintained and operated within design specifications during normal working hours.

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers of nearby premises

8. Non Standard Condition 4 (Pre Commencement Condition)

Before the uses commences a scheme to control the transmission of noise and vibration from any mechanical ventilation system installed shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented prior to the permitted use commencing. Thereafter, the equipment shall be properly maintained and operated during normal working hours.

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers of nearby premises

9. Non Standard Condition 5 (Pre Commencement Condition)

This permission relates solely to the change of use of the premises and the installation of the extract duct illustrated by drawing number PL-5157_05 and to no other matters whatsoever.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

10. Non Standard Condition 6 (Pre Commencement Condition)

Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted, a grease trap shall be fitted to the foul drainage system and thereafter the equipment shall be properly maintained and retained.

Reason: In the interests of amenity.

3 Reason for Approval

The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the aims, objectives and provisions of Policies DC16, DC33, DC36, DC55, and DC61 of the LDF Core

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

Note: Following a change in government legislation a fee is now required when submitting details pursuant to the discharge of conditions, in order to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications and Deemed Applications) (Amendment) (England) Regulations, which came into force from 06.04.2008. A fee of £85 per request (or £25 where the related permission was for extending or altering a dwellinghouse) is needed.

- 4** The applicant should have regard to the following guidance and issues:
- The Food Industry Guides to Good Hygiene Practice
 - Workplace, Health, Safety and Welfare Approved Code of Practice L24 ISBN 0-7176-0413-6 available to order from book shops
- Further information is available at the following web sites:
- Food safety - www.food.gov.uk/foodindustry/
 - Occupational safety & health - www.hse.gov.uk

Applicants have found it beneficial to consider the items below before final detailed plans are produced:

1. provision of suitable outside bin storage
2. provision of a grease trap on the foul drainage
3. proper storage and disposal of waste oil
4. vehicle and pedestrian routes when loading and unloading
5. vehicle and pedestrian routes for customers

Finally, food premises must be registered with Environmental Health at least 28 days before opening. It is an offence for premises to trade without registration. A registration form is available from our office or at our website: online.havering.gov.uk/officeforms/licence_food_business.ofml

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

APPLICATION NO:	P0540.12	
WARD :	Romford Town	Date Received: 25th April 2012
ADDRESS:	91 Eastern Road Romford	
PROPOSAL:	Side and rear extension to existing dwelling at ground and first floor Revised plans received 08-06-2012	
DRAWING NO(S):		
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions given at the end of the report.	

CALL-IN

The application has been called in by Councillor Frederick Thompson on the basis of the bulk of the proposal, and the proposal being out of keeping in the street scene.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject dwelling is a two-storey, semi-detached, late Victorian dwelling with a pebbledash (front elevation) and facing brick (side and rear elevation) appearance and a tiled, hipped roof. The property has a characteristic two storey rear projection, with an eaves height set 0.7m lower than that of the main house. The roof of the projection is hipped and shared with the identical projection of the attached neighbour at No. 89. The property has a detached single garage in the rear garden. There is also parking for one vehicle on a hardstanding to the front of the property and the capacity to create 1 further space.

The surrounding area is characterised by two storey semi-detached dwellings. No trees will be affected by the proposed development. The property is bounded to both sides by 1.8m high close boarded fences.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The proposal comprises a two storey side extension, and a part single, part two storey rear extension.

The two storey side extension would measure 2.34m wide by 7.63 deep at ground floor level and 6.63m deep at first floor level, being set back by 1m from the front building line. The side extension would extend to the boundary with the unattached neighbour at No. 93. The roof would be hipped, continuing the eaves from the main house but with a lower ridge line of 7.48m high. A hidden gutter arrangement would be utilised to prevent encroachment onto the neighbouring property. The ground floor would comprise an enlarged living room and a bike store with a passage to the rear garden. At first floor level the extension would comprise a bedroom and en-suite bathroom.

The rear extension would sit adjacent to the original rear projection and would have a width of 3.7m, being set off the boundary with the unattached neighbour by 1m. The ground floor element would measure 4m deep and the first floor element would measure 3m deep with a monopitch roof to the projecting ground floor element. The roof to the first floor rear extension would be set at right angles to the main roof and finished with a hipped end. The eaves would be slightly lower than the eaves of the main house, and the ridgeline would be 6.67m high. The

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

rear extension would comprise a dining room at ground floor level and a bedroom at first floor level. The rear extension would necessitate the demolition of the existing garage.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P0124.12 Single / two storey side and rear extensions - refused

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbouring occupiers were notified of the application; objections have been received from 10 neighbouring occupiers, and from a local historian. The concerns raised were as follows:

1. Eastern Road consists of largely unspoilt traditional late Victorian architecture. The proposed extensions would detract from the character and appearance of the subject dwelling and the streetscene.
2. No. 91 sits forward of the unattached neighbour, so the extension would be clearly visible within the streetscene, despite the setback at first floor level.
3. The bulk and mass of the two storey rear extension will block daylight and sunlight to the unattached neighbour at No. 93
4. The door at the front of the side extension would disrupt the rhythm of the street and make the extension look like a separate dwelling, and 89-91 appear as a set of terraces
5. The proposed hidden gutter feature is out of keeping with the subject dwelling and the streetscene and will appear incongruous with the overhanging eaves of the subject dwelling
6. The extensions are over large and would be overbearing
7. Building to the boundary would close the gap between the two pairs of semi-detached properties, which would be detrimental to the streetscene, breaking the rhythm of regular spacing between the properties.
8. The side extension would cause maintenance issues for the unattached neighbour at No. 93, as workmen would be left with a small gap to repair gutters etc
9. The extension would prejudice the development of the unattached neighbour at No. 93.
10. The proposed rear extension would be oppressive and overbearing to the unattached neighbour at No. 93.
11. The proposal contravenes Policy DC61, in that the development would not complement or improve the area, would have an unacceptable impact on the unattached neighbour and would prejudice the development of adjoining land.
12. The proposed extension would remove parking from the side of the house without finding other provision within the curtilage of the property.
13. The proposal fails to address the issues raised by the Heritage Officer in response to the previously refused application.
14. The rear windows in the side and rear extensions would intrude on the privacy of the unattached neighbour at No. 93.
15. The side extension would destroy the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties
16. The rear extension would be excessively deep and bulky and too close to the neighbouring boundary, having an unacceptable impact on the amenity of No. 93.
17. The side extension would result in a narrow alleyway, between the subject dwelling and the unattached neighbour. The alleyway would be a dark, unlit, non-defensible area, contrary to government guidelines.
18. The proposal does not comply with the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.
19. The rear extension would be visible from Carlton Road and would have a detrimental impact on this view.
20. The extension is located to the south of the unattached neighbour and would therefore result in an unacceptable loss of sunlight

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

In reference to point 8, it should be noted that this is not a valid planning consideration. The remaining issues raised in these responses will be considered in the Design and Amenity sections below.

Despite the application not being located in the Conservation Area, the Heritage Officer was also consulted as a result of the character and relatively unspoilt nature of the streetscene. The Heritage Officer's advice is pending and Members will be updated verbally at the meeting of any comments received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.
DC33 & DC61 - LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

STAFF COMMENTS

Since the consultation with neighbouring properties and the Heritage Officer, revised plans have been submitted. The proposed door and window to the front of the side extension have been replaced with a garage door.

The current application is a resubmission of the previously refused application, reference no. P0124.12. The application was refused for the following two reasons:

1. The proposed two storey rear extension would, by reason of its excessive depth, bulk and position close to the boundaries of the site, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development, to the detriment of the rear garden environment, as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.
2. The proposed alterations to the roof of the existing rear projection would, by reason of its poor design and relationship with the neighbouring roof, have an unacceptable impact on the rear garden environment, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD

The revised application differs from the previous application in the following ways:

- The alterations to the roof of the rear projection have been deleted from the scheme.
- The proposed first floor rear extension has been reduced to 3m in depth and brought off the boundary with the neighbouring property by 1m, subsequently reducing the width by 1m. The eaves height of the rear extension has been lowered in height.
- An undercroft on the ground floor has been removed from the scheme

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The proposed two storey side extension would impact on the streetscene as it would reduce the characteristic spacing between the properties and unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. However, the principal of two storey side extensions to semi-detached properties, which extend to the boundary with the unattached neighbour, has been widely accepted on the proviso that a 1m set back from the front building line is achieved at first floor level, to reduce the terracing effect and create a subservient impression. Therefore, staff do not consider that a refusal of the scheme can be justified on this basis.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

The proposed hidden gutter arrangement is not ideal as it does not replicate the traditional deep overhanging eaves to be found within the streetscene, however the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD notes that although a traditional gutter arrangement is preferred, a hidden gutter detail may be acceptable. Staff consider that the proposed hidden gutter detail is not so detrimental to the character of the property and the streetscene that a refusal could be justified on this basis.

The proposed side extension is not substantial in width compared to the subject dwelling. Despite the 1m set back, the extension would partially be visible from the side as the unattached neighbour is set back 1m from the front building line of the subject dwelling. However, as the proposed extension would not protrude beyond the unattached neighbour, staff consider that the side extension is not of such bulk and mass as would cause significant harm to the streetscene.

To conclude, staff consider that the design of the two storey side extension as viewed from the street would be acceptable, replicating the hipped roof design and with appropriate materials, fenestration and a traditional garage door, and therefore the proposed two storey side extension would have an acceptable impact on the streetscene.

The proposed two storey rear extension complies with the policies in the SPD. The first floor element has been restricted to 3m in depth and the ground floor element restricted to 4m in depth. The roof would be set at 90 degrees to the main roof and finished with a hipped end. The width has been reduced from the previous scheme, and no longer appears overly bulky or dominant.

The eaves line of the proposed rear extension has been set lower than the main roof, but higher than the original rear projection, and the first floor element of the rear extension is set back by 1m from the rear projection. This arrangement of successive eaves lines stepping up on the retreating built elements is considered to be a sympathetic approach, with the proposed rear extension providing a link between the rear projection and the main roof, rather than dominating the rear elevation.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The side extension would not be visible to the attached neighbour at No. 89, and the rear extension would not protrude beyond the existing two storey rear projection and would therefore also not be visible to the attached neighbour. Therefore the proposed development would not have an impact on that occupiers amenity.

The proposed side extension would be built up to the boundary of No. 93, the unattached neighbour. However, it would not protrude beyond the rear building line of No. 93, and No. 93 has no flank windows which would face the side extension. The proposed side extension would not therefore result in a loss of light to no. 93, or appear overbearing or intrusive. There are no proposed side windows to the side extension, and the rear window would be set forward of the rear building line of the No.93 and therefore would not result in any loss of privacy to No. 93.

The proposed side extension would result in an enclosure of the passage to the side of No. 93, which would darken it. However, staff do not consider that this would prove sufficiently harmful to the amenity and safety of the occupants of No. 93 to justify a refusal.

From the previous scheme, the proposed two storey rear extension has been reduced in both depth and width, and no longer sits on the boundary with the neighbouring property. The first floor element of the extension would now protrude only 1.2m beyond the rear building line of No.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

93 and would be set over 2m away from the flank wall of No. 93. From the corner of No. 93, a line taken at a 30 degree angle would not be impeded by the proposed two storey rear extension; typically if an extension does not break a 45 degree line from neighbouring windows, the impact on neighbouring light and amenity is considered to be acceptable. The proposed extension will therefore have less of an impact than other extensions permitted under the SPD, therefore, despite the extension being located to the south west of No. 93, staff conclude that the impact on the rear windows of No. 93 would be within acceptable limits.

No. 93 also has an original rear projection. It has a flank ground floor window, which acts as the sole light source to a dining room, which constitutes a habitable room. The proposed two storey element of the rear extension would not protrude across the face of this window. However, even if it did, the reduced height and width of the extension means that the extension would not cut a 45 degree line taken from the sill of this window. Therefore, again, the impact of the rear extension on this flank window is considered to be within acceptable limits.

The proposed rear extension would have no flank windows which could intrude on privacy. The rear window would be located over 2m from the boundary with No. 93 and would only have oblique views of windows of No. 93.

To conclude, staff acknowledge that the proposed development would impact on the occupiers of No. 93, but consider that the impact would be within acceptable limits, as determined by the policies within the SPD, and therefore the impact would not be of sufficient harm to justify a refusal of the application.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The property has one parking space in the front garden and the garage at the rear. The proposed development would create a four bedroom dwelling and result in the loss of parking to the side or rear of the property, leaving only one parking space for a four bedroom dwelling. Council policy typically requires two spaces for a four bedroom dwelling, so the dwelling would be left with a shortfall. However, Eastern Road has a Public Transport Accessibility Level Rating of 5, so it is a highly accessible location and therefore a lower level of parking provision is justified. The dwelling is also located in a controlled parking zone, with no parking permitted between 9.30am and 5.30pm. Staff consider that this will assist in preventing any potential parking issues as a result of overspill.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The design of the proposed development is considered to be acceptable, and the development would have an acceptable impact on the streetscene and rear garden scene. The development would impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, but this impact would be within acceptable limits, as defined within the SPD. Parking issues are sufficiently mitigated against as the subject dwelling is located within a Controlled Parking Zone.

The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the aims and objectives of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and approval is recommended accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to conditions

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
21st June 2012
OUTSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD

1. SC03 (Time limit for commencement) 2yrs
2. SC10 (Matching materials)
3. SC32 (Accordance with plans)
4. SC46 (Standard flank window condition)
5. Reason for Approval

The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the aims, objectives and provisions of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

Note: Following a change in government legislation a fee is now required when submitting details pursuant to the discharge of conditions, in order to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications and Deemed Applications) (Amendment) (England) Regulations, which came into force from 06.04.2008. A fee of £85 per request (or £25 where the related permission was for extending or altering a dwellinghouse) is needed.
