

Reference:	16/01418/FULH
Ward:	West Leigh
Proposal:	Raise ridge height and erect hip to gable roof extension to front and rear with dormers to side and balcony to front
Address:	71 Marine Parade, Leigh-On-Sea, Essex SS9 2NQ
Applicant:	M. Gibbons
Agent:	A. Green
Consultation Expiry:	7 th September 2016
Expiry Date:	30 th September 2016
Case Officer:	Naomi Scully
Plan Nos:	761 00, 761 01 B, 761 02, 761 05 A, 761 03 A, 761 06 G, 761 04 B, 761 07 G
Recommendation:	REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION



1 The Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought to raise the ridge height and erect a hip to gable roof extension to the front and rear with dormers to the sides and a balcony to the front. It is proposed to raise the ridge height of the dwelling by 0.6 metres.
- 1.2 The three hipped roof dormers to the west flank elevation, sited slightly below the proposed ridgeline, above the eaves would project a maximum of 1.86 metres from the roof scape. The proposed dormers would be a maximum height of 2.4 metres.
- 1.3 To the east flank elevation it is proposed to form a cat slide roof dormer aligned with the proposed ridge height, starting 0.40 metres above the eaves, projecting 3.7 metres from the roofscape, 2.4 metres high and 9.8 metres long. It is also proposed to insert two roof lights to the east flank elevation.
- 1.4 All proposed materials to the doors, roof, walls and windows would match existing.

2 Site and Surroundings

- 2.1 The application site is located to the south of Marine Parade, Harley Street is to the west and Herschell Road is to the east. The site is occupied by a large detached two storey property in an Arts and Crafts style with a number of decorative elements such as the large first floor timber jettied window, exposed timber rafters to the eaves, hipped clay tile roof and tall feature chimneys with brickwork decoration. The application property is one of the more distinctive properties in the street and is prominently located on the junction to Harley Street.
- 2.2 The surrounding area is residential in character consisting of large family houses mainly built between the 1920s and 1940s. There is an eclectic mix of designs but cohesion is provided by the scale of two storeys and consistent materials including white render and red tile. Almost all properties have a forward facing roofslopes breaking the scale of the properties into comfortable proportions and is a feature of the frontage. Most properties have some form of feature window or gable to the front which provides interesting and animated streetscape.

3 Planning Considerations

- 3.1 The key considerations in relation to this application are the principle of the development, design and impact on the character of the area and impact on residential amenity.

4 Appraisal

Principle of Development

NPPF; DPD 1 (Core Strategy) Policies KP2 and CP4; Development Management DPD Policy DM1.

- 4.1 The proposal is considered in the context of the Core Strategy DPD policies KP2 and CP4, policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD2 and the Design and Townscape Guide. These policies and guidance support extensions to properties in most cases but require that such alterations and extensions respect the existing character and appearance of the building. Therefore, the principle is acceptable subject to the detailed design considerations below.

Design and Impact on the Character of the Area:

NPPF; DPD 1 (Core Strategy) Policies KP2 and CP4; Development Management DPD Policy DM1; SPD 1 (Design & Townscape Guide (2009))

- 4.2 It should be noted that good design is a fundamental requirement of new development to achieve high quality living environments. Its importance is reflected in the NPPF, in the Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Core Strategy and also in Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD. The Design and Townscape Guide (SPD1) also states that *“the Borough Council is committed to good design and will seek to create attractive, high-quality living environments.”*
- 4.3 Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that *“good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.”*
- 4.4 Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD states that all development should *“add to the overall quality of the area and respect the character of the site, its local context and surroundings in terms of its architectural approach, height, size, scale, form, massing, density, layout, proportions, materials, townscape and/or landscape setting, use, and detailed design features”*.
- 4.5 According to Policy KP2 of Core Strategy (CS) new development should *“respect the character and scale of the existing neighbourhood where appropriate”*. Policy CP4 of CS requires that development proposals should *“maintain and enhance the amenities, appeal and character of residential areas, securing good relationships with existing development, and respecting the scale and nature of that development”*.
- 4.6 Paragraph 370 states that *“In some cases it may be possible to increase the roofspace and remove the need for a side dormer by changing a hipped roof to a gable end. This type of development can be more acceptable than a side dormer provided it is not out of character with the streetscene or leads to an unbalanced street block or pair of semis i.e. It is more appropriate for a detached or end of terrace property than only one of a matching pair of semi’s which would be considered unacceptable.”*

- 4.7 Paragraph 366 of The Design and Townscape Guide (SPD1) states that *“proposals for additional roof accommodation within existing properties must respect the style, scale and form of the existing roof design and the character of the wider townscape. Dormer windows, where appropriate, should appear incidental in the roof slope (i.e. set in from both side walls, set well below the ridgeline and well above the eaves). Large box style dormers should be avoided, especially where they have public impact, as they appear bulky and unsightly. Smaller individual dormers are preferred.”*
- 4.8 It is proposed to raise the ridge height by 0.60 metres, erect hip to gable roof extension to the front and rear with a modern glazed gable end to the front elevation, three pitched roof dormers to the west elevation and a large catslide dormer to the east elevation. It is noted surrounding properties have glazed sections to the roof to take advantage of the attractive outlook however they have achieved this within a smaller element such as a subservient projecting gables which have not impacted on the roof form to the front or the overall character and portions of the property.
- 4.9 The proposed three pitched roof dormers to the west elevation roofscape are considered to be dominant, sited close to the ridgeline and would be contrary to the Design and Townscape Guide and would not be inkeeping with the character of the area. The proposed catslide dormer to the east is considered to be very large and bulky, conflicting with the feature chimney and is therefore considered to be a very prominent feature in the streetscene and would be detrimental to the character of the existing property.
- 4.10 The proposed alterations would result in the loss of the dwellings roof form, decorative eaves and alter the scale of the roof which would have a detrimental impact on the articulation of the frontage and interplay of these features. The inclusion of significant roof extensions is considered to alter the proportions of the front elevation and reduce the prominence of the feature chimneys to the flank elevations. It is therefore considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the existing unique character of the property and surrounding area.
- 4.11 The overall height increase and the erection of a hip to gable would appear out of character and detrimental to the unique character of the dwelling. There is no objection in principle to some form of accommodation within the roof. However it is considered that the existing height and hip should be maintained particularly to the front elevation.

Impact on Residential Amenity:

NPPF; Development Management DPD Policy DM1; SPD 1 (Design & Townscape Guide (2009))

- 4.12 The Design and Townscape Guide (SPD1) states that *“extensions must respect the amenity of neighbouring buildings and ensure not to adversely affect light, outlook or privacy of the habitable rooms in adjacent properties.”* (Paragraph 343 - Alterations and Additions to Existing Residential Buildings).

Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD requires all development to be appropriate in its setting by respecting neighbouring development and existing residential amenities *“having regard to privacy, overlooking, outlook, noise and disturbance, sense of enclosure/overbearing relationship, pollution, daylight and sunlight.”*

- 4.13 Given the west flank elevation of the applicant property is sited along Harley Street it is considered the proposed three pitched roof dormers to this elevation would not be overbearing or result in a sense of enclosure for the occupants of surrounding properties. Due to the proposed projection, height and length of the catslide dormer to the east elevation roofscape it is considered that the extension would be visible from the windows in the side elevation of No. 70. However, due to the separation distances between the properties and the orientation of the dwellings it is considered that the impact on light and outlook would not be harmful to an extent that would justify the refusal of the application.
- 4.14 The proposed dormers to the side of the west flank elevation would increase the level of overlooking available from the applicant property however taken the separation distance of approximately 13.5 metres to the east flank elevation of No. 77 it is considered the increased level of overlooking would not result in a loss of privacy for the occupants of this property or others along Harley Street. The windows of the proposed catslide dormer to the east elevation roofscape would directly overlook those to the west flank elevation of No. 70. As the windows, are secondary it is considered that conditions can reasonably be used to require the use of obscure glazing to prevent a loss of privacy and overlooking for the occupants of No. 70 detrimental to their residential amenity.
- 4.15 It is noted that the neighbouring property No. 70 Marine Parade has recently added a large dormer/roof extension. The extension proposed by this application is not materially worse than the impact of that development provided that suitable conditions are used.

Community Infrastructure Levy

CIL Charging Schedule 2015

- 4.16 The new floor space created by the proposal would be less than 100m². Therefore, the proposed development is not CIL liable.

5 Conclusion

- 5.1 The proposed gable to the front elevation and detailed design of the proposed dormer to the east flank elevation is considered to be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area.

6 Planning Policy Summary

- 6.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) : Section 7 (Requiring Good design)
- 6.2 Development Plan Document 1: Core Strategy Policies KP2 (Development Principles) and CP4 (Environment & Urban Renaissance)

- 6.3 Development Management DPD 2015: DM1 (Design Quality)
- 6.4 Supplementary Planning Document 1: Design & Townscape Guide (2009)
- 6.5 CIL Charging Schedule 2015

7 Representation Summary

Public Consultation

- 7.1 Four neighbouring properties were notified and a site notice was posted at the site. One letter of objection was received objecting to the following:
 - Overdevelopment by virtue of bulk, to a property already heavily extended in 2002
 - The overall result of the application will further diminish the sense of spaciousness in the street scene especially when considering the property's prominent position
 - The dormers by their size and bulk are not incidental to the roof space furthering the detrimental effect in the street scene
 - A three storey house will be created due to the increased height in the roof line, accentuated by the erect of hip to gable roof to both front and rear
 - No architectural merit to the design. All the proposed elevations are ugly due to height and bulk and will be overbearing to neighbouring properties
 - The combined impact of the plans would cause harm to the local townscape, and consequently to the area's character and appearance.
- 7.2 Councillor Evans has requested that this planning application go before the Development Control Committee for consideration.

Leigh Town Council

- 7.3 No comments.

Design and Regeneration

- 7.4 The following comments were received:

Marine Parade is characterised by large family houses mainly built between the 1920s-1940s. There is an eclectic mix of designs but cohesion is provided by the scale (2 storeys) and consistent materials including white render and red tile. Almost all properties have a forward facing roofslopes breaking the scale of the properties into comfortable proportions and this is a feature of the frontage. Most properties have some form of feature window or gable to the front which provides and interesting and animated streetscape. The application property is a large detached two storey property. It is a unique design in the Arts and Crafts Style, which is a feature of the area, and includes a number of decorative elements such as the large first floor timber jettied window, exposed timber rafters to the eaves, a hipped clay tile roof and tall feature chimneys with brickwork decoration. It is one of the more distinctive properties in the street and is prominently located on the junction to Harley Street.

The application is seeking to undertake significant remodelling to the roof including raising the ridge by 0.6m, changing the hips to gables at the front and rear, inserting a modern glazed end to the southern gable, 3 pitched roof dormers to the Harley Street elevation and a large catslide dormer to the east elevation against the neighbouring property. There is a concern that the proposals would have a significant and detrimental impact on the character of the existing property and the wider streetscene. The change in roof scale and form and insertion of significant roof extensions would alter the proportions of the frontage, reduce the prominence of the feature chimneys and generally would have a detrimental impact on the existing character of the property. It is noted that at present there is a positive relationship between the feature jettied bay, the exposed rafters to the eaves and the hipped roof which are all characteristics of the Arts and Crafts style of architecture. Therefore although the bay remains, the loss of the roof form and its decorative eaves would have a detrimental impact on the articulation of the frontage and interplay of these features and this would be regrettable. It is noted that there is an attractive outlook to the front and a number of other properties in the wider streetscene have sought to glaze sections of the roof to take advantage of this but where these occur they are mainly within a smaller element such as a subservient projecting gable and have not impacted on the form of the roof to the front or the overall character and portions of the property. In this instance, however, the height increase and the change of shape from hip to gable clashes with the Arts and Crafts character of the property and would appear out of place and detrimental to its unique character. Therefore, whilst there is no objection in principle to some form of accommodation within the roof it is considered that the existing height and hip should be maintained particularly to the front of the building.

In addition to concerns regarding the overall change in roof form there is also an objection to the proposed dormer additions. To the west side, which is more exposed, it is proposed to insert three pitched roof dormers. Dormers are not a common feature of Marine Parade and where they do occur there is normally only one ensuring that they do not dominate the roofscape and wider streetscene. There is a concern that the 3 proposed in this case, which are set very close to the ridge, contrary to advice contained with the DTG, will appear over dominant to the side and to crowd the ridge when seen from the front. Furthermore the proposed catslide dormer to the east slope is very large and bulky, spans almost the whole depth between the ridge and the eaves and conflicts with the existing feature chimney. This element would be very prominent in the streetscene, detrimental to the character of the existing property and is also unacceptable.

Burges Estate Residents Association

7.5 No comments received.

8 Relevant Planning History

- 8.1 16/01084/FULH – Erect hip to gable to form habitable accommodation, install roof extension and two dormers to side elevations – Application Withdrawn
- 8.2 02/01205/FUL – Erect part single/part first floor/part two storey extension at rear incorporating garage with pitched roof – Permission Granted

9 Recommendation

REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reasons:

- 01 The proposed alterations to the scale and form of the roofscape would be prominent and unsympathetic features to the detriment of the appearance of the existing property and the character of the area contrary to the NPPF, Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and advice contained within the Design and Townscape Guide.**

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 the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The detailed analysis is set out in a report prepared by officers. In the circumstances the proposal is not considered to be sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority is willing 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, should the applicant wish to exercise this option in accordance with the Council's pre-application advice service.

Informative

- 1 You are advised that as the proposed extension(s) to your property equates to less than 100sqm of new floorspace the development benefits from a Minor Development Exemption under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and as such no charge is payable. See www.southend.gov.uk/cil for further details about CIL.**