

Reference: 21/01578/HHA	Site: 41 Scratton Road Stanford Le Hope Essex SS17 0PA
Ward: Stanford Le Hope West	Proposal: Two storey rear extension with rear and front dormer and side window alteration.

Plan Number(s):		
Reference	Name	Received
P3-24-01	Location Plan	14th September 2021
P3-24-02	Existing Floor Plans	14th September 2021
P3-24-03	Existing Elevations	14th September 2021
P3-24-04	Proposed Site Layout	14th September 2021
P3-24-05	Proposed Floor Plans	14th September 2021
P3-24-06	Proposed Elevations	14th September 2021
P3-24-07	Proposed Sections	14th September 2021

The application is also accompanied by:

N/A

Applicant: Scott Turp	Validated: 14 September 2021 Date of expiry: 9 December 2021 (Extension of Time agreed with Applicant)
Recommendation: Refuse	

This application is scheduled for determination by the Council's Planning Committee because it has been Called In by Councillors Anderson, Duffin, Hebb, Huelin and Collins (in accordance with Part 3 (b) 2.1 (c) of the Council's constitution).

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application seeks approval for a two storey rear extension, which includes a first floor rear dormer with sloping roof, a front pitched roof dormer and fenestration alterations to the north east flank elevation.
- 1.2 This application is an identical resubmission of application ref: 21/00767/HHA, which was refused in July 2021 for the following reason:

The rear extension would, by reason of its design and appearance, result in a visually awkward and incongruous addition that would be unduly dominating of the rear elevation of the dwelling and harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality. For these reasons, the proposal is unacceptable and contrary to Policies CSTP22, PMD1 and PMD2 of the adopted Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development 2015 and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2017.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site features a detached chalet style dwelling. The dwelling benefits from a two storey rear extension extending part-way across the rear elevation closest to the north east side of the property. This is visible within the street scene, particularly when approaching from the Corringham Road junction. These additions were approved under two separate applications submitted in 1982 and 1984. The overall form and appearance of these additions are representative of a mansard design, which represents a different roof form to that of the host dwelling.
- 2.2 The property is set within a residential area where the appearance and character of the street scene is varied, consisting of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties. The application site is of a distinct design, particularly the original front element facing onto Scratton Road itself, which is reflected in a property of the same appearance located on the same side of the road five properties north of the site at no. 51 Scratton Road. Whilst there are visible differences between the two properties as a result of non-original additional development, both properties are broadly of the same appearance.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

Application Reference	Description of Proposal	Decision
82/00769/FUL	Rear Single Storey Addition with Balcony.	Approved
84/01011/FUL	1st Floor Extension. Plan, Local Planning Authority received 5.12.84.	Approved
21/00767/HHA	Two storey rear extension with dormer, front pitched	Refused

	roof dormer and window alteration to flank elevation	
--	--	--

4.0 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 Detailed below is a summary of the consultation responses received. The full version of each consultation response can be viewed on the Council's website via public access at the following link: www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning

4.2 PUBLICITY:

This application has been advertised by way of individual neighbour notification letters and the Council's online planning register. Three comments have been received; two in support and one representation. The comments have outlined the following:

- The proposal would have no impact on neighbouring property to the rear of the site;
- Roof line would be in keeping with the existing;
- An alternate dormer design would not be in keeping with the style of the house.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Guidance

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The revised NPPF was published on 27th March 2012, revised on 24th July 2018, February 2019 and again in July 2021. Paragraph 11 of the Framework sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 2 of the Framework confirms the tests in s.38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and s.70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and that the Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions. Paragraph 10 states that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The following headings and content of the NPPF are relevant to the consideration of the current proposals:

- 2. Achieving sustainable development
- 4. Decision Making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places

5.2 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

In March 2014 the former Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched its planning practice guidance web-based resource. This was accompanied by a Written Ministerial Statement, which includes a list of the previous planning policy guidance documents cancelled when the NPPF was launched. NPPG contains a range of subject areas, with each area containing several sub-topics. Those of particular relevance to the determination of this planning application include:

- Consultation and pre-decision makers
- Design: process and tools
- Determining a planning application

5.3 Local Planning Policy: Thurrock Local Development Framework (2015)

The “Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development” was adopted by Council on the 28 February 2015. The following policies apply to the proposals:

Thematic Policies

- CSTP22 (Thurrock Design)

Policies for the Management of Development:

- PMD1 (Minimising Pollution and Impacts on Amenity)
- PMD2 (Design and Layout)

Thurrock Design Guide: Residential Alterations & Extensions SPD (RAE)
September 2017

5.4 Thurrock Local Plan

In February 2014 the Council embarked on the preparation of a new Local Plan for the Borough. Between February and April 2016 the Council consulted formally on an ‘Issues and Options (Stage 1)’ document and simultaneously undertook a ‘Call for Sites’ exercise. In December 2018 the Council began consultation on an Issues and Options [Stage 2 Spatial Options and Sites] document, this consultation has now closed and the responses have been considered and reported to Council. On 23 October 2019 the Council agreed the publication of the Issues and Options 2 Report of Consultation on the Council’s website and agreed the approach to

preparing a new Local Plan.

6.0 ASSESSMENT

6.1 Policy Context

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment which is indivisible from good planning and that it is important to plan for high quality design for all development including individual buildings.

Policy CSTP22 (Thurrock Design) of the Core Strategy indicates that development proposals must demonstrate high quality design founded on a thorough understanding of, and positive response to, the local context.

Policy PMD1 (Minimising Pollution and Impacts on Amenity) states that “Development will not be permitted where it would cause unacceptable effects on (i) the amenities of the area; (ii) the amenity of neighbouring occupants; or (iii) the amenity of future occupiers of the site”.

Policy PMD2 (Design and Layout) of the Core Strategy requires that all design proposals should respond to the sensitivity of the site and its surroundings and must contribute positively to the character of the area in which it is proposed and should seek to contribute positively to local views, townscape, heritage assets and natural features and contribute to the creation of a positive sense of place.

The Residential Alterations & Extensions SPD (RAE) September 2017 states that:

4.1.1 The extension or alteration should respect respond positively to the character of the original dwelling such that its character is maintained or enhanced

5.2.2 Rear infill extensions should be as close to 2m in height along the boundary as reasonably possible, where the boundary is an existing garden fence or wall of up to 2m in height.

5.2.3 Where rear extensions can be seen from a public realm, more restrictions apply including how well they complement historical pattern of the neighbouring rear extensions, the treatment of the façade visible and roof form

5.4 The size of the proposed alteration, the prominence of the roof slope and the character of the surrounding area will be taken into account when considering weather a proposed roof alteration is acceptable

5.4.4 Roof conversions and additions will only be acceptable where high quality design is employed, where additions are in scale are in scale with the existing roof, and where addition does not spoil the existing roof form.

5.4.5 The design of dormers should follow the guidelines set out in the table 1 below.

Table 1: Dormer Windows and Roof-Lights

Street-facing roof slope prominent side roof slope	Visible but less prominent side or rear roof slope	Rear roof slope that is not visible from a public space
<p>Dormer window may not be acceptable regardless of design.</p> <p>Box dormer unacceptable except where this is characteristic of the original architecture of the area.</p>	<p>Dormer window acceptable where the proposal avoids overlooking.</p> <p>Modest box dormer may be acceptable subject to size restrictions.</p>	<p>Dormer window acceptable in principle where the proposal avoids overlooking, subject to size restrictions.</p>
<p>Dormers should not occupy more than one third of the width of the roof.</p> <p>Maximum width of individual dormer 1.4m.</p>	<p>Dormers should not occupy more than one half of the width of the roof.</p> <p>Maximum width of individual dormer 2m.</p>	<p>Dormers should not occupy more than three-fifths of the roof width if the height exceeds three-fifths of ridge-to-eave distance; or not occupy more than three-fifths of the ridge-to-eave distance if the total width exceeds three-fifths of the roof width.</p>
<p>Roof-lights may not be acceptable in sensitive settings.</p>	<p>Roof-lights generally acceptable in principle, where design and layout are considered acceptable.</p>	<p>Roof-lights generally acceptable in principle, where design and layout are considered acceptable.</p>

*Top of dormer window to be at least 0.3m below the roof ridge.
No plane of a dormer should be within 0.6m of a hip line or verge.*

Background

6.2 Plans submitted with this current planning application are identical to the previous refusal (Ref: 21/00767/HHA). No additional supporting information has been submitted for consideration. Prior to the submission of this application, Officers provided feedback to the applicant and the agent and identified alternative design approaches in an attempt to assist the applicant in identifying a design solution that would have been acceptable to officers. However, the applicant has chosen to re-submit an application showing an identical proposal.

6.3 The assessment below covers the following areas:

- I. Principle of Development
- II. Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Existing Dwelling and the Surrounding Area
- III. Effect on Neighbouring Properties.

I. PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

6.4 There are no in principle objections given the application site is set within a residential area.

II. IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE EXISTING DWELLING AND THE SURROUNDING AREA.

Front Dormer

6.5 The site currently benefits from a gable ended projection on the front facing roof scape and a dormer sited on the north east side of the roof slope, positioned towards the rear of the property but visible from the street scene.

6.6 The existing side dormer is not an original feature of the property and was a later addition. Given that both dormers would be visible from the public realm it would be reasonable to consider that both non-original pitched roof dormers should be of the same proportions finished in matching materials. Whilst the proposed front pitched roof dormer would be of a larger scale than the existing side dormer and vary in design and appearance from the existing non-original dormer, it would be finished in a render and window layout similar to that of the original triangular dormer within the same roof slope. Therefore, it is considered that the dormer would be suitably representative of the existing character of the host dwelling and, as such, the front dormer addition would not be harmful to the character of the host dwelling.

6.7 Furthermore, due to the presence and design of other front dormers within the street scene, it is not considered that the front dormer would detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene or the locality. As a result, the front dormer would not have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the immediate street scene or wider area given the variation of dwelling styles.

Rear Extension

6.8 The rear extension would be relatively small in scale at ground floor, creating a larger increase in floor area to the first floor through the alteration of the angle of the roof pitch and the introduction of a sloping roof dormer. The extension would be positioned to the rear of the original host dwelling rather than the later rear extension, but would connect with the side elevation of the rear addition.

6.9 As set out above, the RAE provides guidance on the size of dormer windows. The roof of the existing rear extension dominates a substantial proportion of the original roofscape of the dwelling and this proposal would fill the majority of the original

roofscape that has not previously been extended. As a result, when the extension is considered alone and in addition to the previous extension at the rear of the dwelling, the resultant rear projections would have an unduly dominating effect on the rear elevation of the dwelling. This conflicts with the design guidance set out within the RAE above, particularly as the roof of the extension would fill more than three fifths of both the height and width of the remaining original roofscape.

- 6.10 The integration of the sloping roof dormer with the gambrel roof of the existing non-original rear element is considered to exacerbate the harm by introducing varying roof forms that result in the dwelling having a jumbled appearance. The proposal would not represent a high quality design and would fail to compliment or contribute positively to the appearance or character of the dwelling, appearing as an incongruous addition.
- 6.11 The extension would be visible from within other properties within the vicinity of the site and there might be fleeting views of the side elevation of the extension from the public domain due to the gap between the dwelling at the application site and the detached neighbour of 43 Scratton Road. Therefore, whilst there would be limited views of the extension from the street, the extension would alter the manner in which the dwelling is viewed within the locality and, for the reasons set out above, it is considered that the effect of this would be harmful and unacceptable.
- 6.12 The proposed rear extension would, therefore, detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling in a manner that is visually unacceptable and in conflict with policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy 2015 and the design guidance contained within the RAE.

Window Alteration

- 6.13 The proposed window alteration would result in the first floor window to the south east gable end flank elevation being reduced in width in order to accommodate internal alterations. Although the smaller opening would be offset from the centre of the gable creating a somewhat unbalanced appearance of detriment to the character and appearance of the host dwelling which would be highly visible from the public realm due to the exposed nature of the elevation when approaching from the north east of Scratton Road, it is not considered that the harm caused in this respect would be substantial. Therefore, no objection is raised to the window alteration and the associated impact upon the street scene.

Overall Assessment

- 6.14 Whilst some elements of the proposal are considered to be acceptable, it is considered that, for the reasons set out above, the proposed rear extension would result in detrimental harm upon the original design and character of the dwelling and represent an incongruous addition that would be unduly dominating of the rear elevation of the original dwelling when considered cumulatively in addition to the previous rear extension.
- 6.15 The applicant has previously identified that the property directly to the south west of the site has recently received planning permission to implement a single storey rear

extension, double hip to gable loft conversion with three rear dormers, one front dormer and alterations to the front elevation (Ref: 20/01816/HHA). It is noted that permission has been granted for works to that dwelling, but the overall design, form and appearance of the proposals and the resultant dwellings would be markedly different. The dwelling at the application site has been extended previously with a two storey rear projection as set out above and, therefore, the dwelling is different to the neighbouring dwelling. From this basis, the starting point for the consideration of the respective applications is different and it is not considered that the permission at that site should carry substantial weight in the assessment of this proposal and does not represent a reason to reach a different decision.

- 6.16 Whilst it is acknowledged the appearance of the street scene is varied, the application site is of a distinct design and appearance, matching the nearby property at no. 51 Scratton Road. Whilst no. 51 also appears to benefit from additional development, this would be considered more sympathetic in relation to the original form of both dwellings. It is also acknowledged that the dwelling at the application site consists of varying forms and styles of later additions. However, regardless of these existing features it would be appropriate to attempt to preserve and enhance the original character of the host dwelling by encouraging an architecturally sympathetic extension. It is not considered that the current proposal achieves this.
- 6.17 Two comments of support have been received from nearby neighbours. One comment outlines that an alternative dormer design would not be in keeping with the current design of the property. This is not a view shared by Officers but, in any event, the assessment should be based on the proposal that has been submitted rather than alternative proposals and, for the reasons set out above, it is considered that the proposed extension would not be visually acceptable.
- 6.18 For these reasons, the proposal is considered to have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling at the application site and the locality. The proposal is, therefore, considered to be unacceptable and contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2015, the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2017 and the NPPF.

III. IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS

- 6.19 The additional front dormer would have a similar outlook to that of the existing first floor front window and would therefore be unlikely to create an additional level of harm upon neighbouring amenity by way of loss of privacy or increased levels of overlooking.
- 6.20 The rear extension would not extend beyond the furthestmost rear building line of the property nor that of the closest neighbour at no. 43. The proposal would have a similar outlook as the remaining windows and doors within the rear elevation and would not result in additional levels of overlooking or loss of privacy harmful to neighbouring amenity.

- 6.21 The proposed side window would have a comparable relationship with the neighbouring property as the existing side window and would not, therefore, harm the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND REASON FOR REFUSAL

- 7.1 Whilst there is no objection to the principle of extending the existing dwelling, it is considered the roof form of the rear extension would conflict with the existing form and character of the host dwelling detrimental to its overall appearance. The proposal is, therefore unacceptable and contrary to policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2015.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Refuse, for the following reasons:

- 1 The rear extension would, by reason of its design and appearance, result in a visually awkward and incongruous addition that would be unduly dominating of the rear elevation of the dwelling and harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality. For these reasons, the proposal is unacceptable and contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the adopted Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development 2015, the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative:

Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) - Positive and Proactive Statement:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant/Agent the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to liaise with the Applicant/Agent to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online:

www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning

