Planning Committee 09 June 2022	Application Reference: 22/00181/HHA

Reference:	Site:
22/00181/HHA	22 Bridge Road
	Grays
	Thurrock
	RM17 6RY
Ward:	Proposal:
Grays Riverside	Single storey side extension

Plan Number(s):		
Reference	Name	Received
22-02	Existing Floor Plans	11th March 2022
22-03	Existing Elevations	11th March 2022
22-04	Proposed Floor Plans	25 th May 2022
22-05 R1	Proposed Elevations	25 th May 2022
22-01	Location Plan and Existing and	11th March 2022
	Proposed Site Layout	

The application is also accompanied by: • Environment Agency Householder Flood Form		
Applicant: Mr Guv Sehmbi	Validated: 21 March 2022	
	Date of expiry:	
	1 July 2022	
	(Extension of time agreed)	
Recommendation: Refusal		

This application is scheduled for determination by the Council's Planning Committee because it has been called in by Cllrs. J Pothecary, M Kerin, J Kent, C Kent and L Worrall (in accordance with the Constitution Chapter 5, Part 3 (b), 2.1 (d) (ii)) to assess the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties.

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

1.1 The application seeks approval for an irregularly-shaped single storey side extension which would extend forward of the front of the dwelling. The proposal would connect with the detached garage associated with the site effectively creating a large infill extension.

1.2 The proposal would be of a flat roof construction with one large roof lantern and be constructed from matching materials. The extension would provide a further reception room for the dwelling.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site hosts a detached two storey 4 bedroom dwelling with a detached single garage with dual pitched roof set perpendicular to the host dwelling. The site is located in a small mews to the east side of Bridge Road serving four properties directly accessible via Bridge Road, and in close proximity of the railway bridge between the junctions of Sejant House and Argent Street.
- 2.2 The site is set within a densely built up residential area where the eastern boundary of the application site abuts with the boundary of an end of terrace property at no. 31 Falcon Avenue.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

Application	Description of Proposal	Decision
Reference		
86/00666/OUT	161 Houses and 185 Flats on 2,3,4, storeys with parking amenity and open space areas.	Approved
86/00666A/FUL	161 Houses and 185 flats	Approved
21/30157/PHMT	Single storey side extension	Advice Given
21/01849/HHA	Single storey side extension	Withdrawn

3.1 Applications 86/00666/OUT and 86/00666A/FUL imposed Permitted Development restrictions including a condition restricting the garage shall be used for the parking of vehicles in relation to the residential use only.

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 public site notice which has been displayed nearby. At the time of drafting the report the consultation period had not yet expired, however, no comments have been received.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5.1 The revised NPPF was published on 27th March 2012, revised on 20th 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:

- 4. Decision-making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places

Planning Practice Guidance

- In March 2014 the 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. PPG contains 42 subject areas, with each area containing several subtopics. Those of particular relevance to the determination of this planning application comprise:
 - Design
 - Determining a planning application

Local Planning Policy

Thurrock Local Development Framework (2015)

5.3 The Council adopted the "Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development Plan Document" in (as amended) in January 2015. The following Core Strategy policies apply to the proposals:

THEMATIC POLICIES

- CSTP22: Thurrock Design
- CSTP23: Thurrock Character and Distinctiveness
- CSTP27: Management and Reduction of Flood Risk

POLICIES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT

- PMD1: Minimising Pollution and Impacts on Amenity
- PMD2: Design and Layout
- PMD8: Parking Standards
- PMD15: Flood Risk Assessment

Thurrock Local Plan

5.4 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.

Thurrock Residential Alterations and Extensions Design Guide (RAE)

5.5 In September 2017 the Council launched the RAE Design Guide which provides advice and guidance for applicants who are proposing residential alterations and extensions. The Design Guide is a supplementary planning document (SPD) which supports policies in the adopted Core Strategy.

6.0 ASSESSMENT

6.1 The assessment below covers the following areas:

- I. Principle of the Development
- II. Site Background
- III. Design and Layout
- IV. Neighbour Amenity Impact
- V. Flood Risk
- VI. Parking

I. PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

6.2 The application site is set within a residential area. There are no land use or in principle objections to the proposal subject to compliance with relevant development management policies.

II. SITE BACKGROUND

- 6.3 By way of background, the proposal is of the same form and coverage as detailed within a recent pre-application enquiry (ref. 21/30157/PHMT) where written advice was provided and followed-up with a meeting with the applicant. Whilst elevations of the intended scheme were not provided at this point, feedback given discouraged the formal submission of a planning application based upon concerns relating to design, scale and disproportionality of the extension and the likelihood of any such application receiving an unfavourable recommendation for these reasons.
- 6.4 A subsequent planning application submitted in October 2021 (ref. 21/01849/HHA) was formally withdrawn by the applicant in January 2022 as the applicant's planning agent had been advised that the scheme would not be recommended favourably given the same design concerns. The current planning application remains of the same design, scale and coverage as the previously withdrawn application.

III. DESIGN AND LAYOUT

6.5 The proposal seeks to provide an additional reception room to the front and side of the dwelling and the extension would effectively extend the side of the dwelling and wraparound the garage filling the remainder of the eastern half of the site. Whilst it is acknowledged the plot may be of a less common shape it would remain imperative that proposals demonstrate good design which is sympathetic to the host dwelling and the overall site in terms of detailed design, scale, coverage and appearance and should comply with Council policy and the RAE design guide.

- 6.6 The proposal would not entail the conversion of the existing garage which would remain as parking for the dwelling.
- 6.7 The proposal is considered to be of a poor design given the scale and coverage of the development appears to have been designed to fit the shape of the plot, rather than be of a sympathetic proposal respectful of the original architectural design and features of the host dwelling and the character of the wider area. As a consequence, the proposed extension is considered to be of a poor design.
- 6.8 Whilst the flat roof would align with the eaves height of the adjacent garage, this would present higher than the existing boundary fence and gate currently visible at the front of the site. The proposal would be visible from Bridge Road as well as from the adjacent Falcon Avenue whereby the longest part of the extension would be most noticeable.
- 6.9 Views from the public realm in Falcon Avenue would likely result in a greater impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene given the full 11.7 metre depth of the proposal would be visible along the boundary of the site. The visibility would be exacerbated by the protrusion of the proposed roof lantern which would span 3.9 metres across the flat roof of the extension. As a consequence, the overall size of the roof would appear as overbearing and dominant in relation to the main dwelling resulting in an incongruous addition harmful to the visual amenity of the area and character and appearance of the street scene.
- 6.10 In addition to the bulk and extensive span of the flat roof when viewed from Falcon Avenue, the proposal would have a maximum width of 8.6 metres at the widest point, which would be considered disproportionate in relation to the width of the existing dwelling which is 8.9 metres wide. Moreover, given the proposal would project forward of the main front wall of the dwelling, this further adds to the visually bulky and excessive dominance of the addition.
- 6.11 The proposal would, by virtue of the poor detailed design and irregular shape and scale of the extension, be likely to result in a development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the main dwelling, immediate street scene and character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23, PMD2 and the RAE and is recommended for refusal for this reason.

IV. NEIGHBOUR AMENITY IMPACT

6.12 Neighbouring properties on Bridge Road would not be adversely affected by the proposal. The neighbouring property at 31 Falcon Avenue would be most affected by virtue of the extent of the development along much of the length of the boundary

between the two properties. However, given the height of the development and the orientation of this neighbouring property, it is considered that the proposal would not result in such a significant loss of light or amenity to this neighbour to justify refusing the application for this reason. The proposal would, therefore, comply with Policy PMD1 with regard to amenity impact.

V. FLOOD RISK

6.13 The site is located within high risk flood zone 2, and an area benefitting from flood defences. An Environment Agency householder flood form has been submitted with the application which states that the floor levels of the proposal would be set no lower than the existing levels within the dwelling, and that floodproofing measures will be incorporated where appropriate. As such, there would be no objections in relation to flood risk and the application would comply with Policy CSTP27.

VI. PARKING

6.14 The proposal would continue to provide adequate off street parking provision in line with the Council's adopted parking Standards and Policy PDM8.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS FOR REFUSAL

7.1 There are no in principle objections to the proposal. The proposal would not result in harmful neighbour amenity or highway impacts. However, the proposal would, by virtue of the poor detailed design and irregular shape and scale of the extension, be likely to result in a development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the main dwelling, immediate street scene and character of the area contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23, PMD2 and the RAE and is recommended for refusal for this reason.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 Refuse, for the following reason:
- 1. The proposal would, by virtue of the poor detailed design and irregular shape and scale of the extension, be likely to result in a development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the main dwelling, immediate street scene and character of the area contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the adopted the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2015, the Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

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

