

Reference:	19/01819/FULH	
Ward:	Prittlewell	
Proposal:	Erect part single/part two storey side and rear extension	
Address:	144 Carlton Avenue, Westcliff-On-Sea, Essex, SS0 0QQ	
Applicant:	Kweku Welsing-Quacoe	
Agent:	DK Building Designs Ltd	
Consultation Expiry:	15 th November 2019	
Expiry Date:	13 th January 2020	
Case Officer:	Scott Davison	
Plan Nos:	3528-03 Rev C & 3591-09 Rev A	
Recommendation:	GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION	



1 Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The application site is a dwellinghouse on the southern side of Carlton Avenue, west of the junction with Commercial Avenue. The site is occupied by a semi-detached house with a hipped roof, covered front porch and bay window at ground floor. There is a driveway to the eastern side of the property for vehicle parking, with the remaining frontage laid to lawn. The property has a pitched roof outbuilding within the rear garden and an existing single storey rear extension.
- 1.2 The street scene is mixed with a variety of semi-detached and detached dwellinghouses and bungalows of varying designs and styles. There is a grass verge to the front of the dwellings bordering the main highway.
- 1.3 The site is not located within a conservation area or subject to any site specific planning policies.

2 The Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission to erect a part single storey rear and side extension/part two storey rear extension to the dwellinghouse. Part of the existing rear projection would be demolished as would a single storey pitched roof outbuilding.
- 2.2 The single storey element of the proposal would project some 4.0m from the rear wall of the existing rear extension on the western side, to a total depth of 7.1m from the existing rear wall of the building. The proposed single storey extension would be set some 2.6m from the shared boundary and would be some 5.4 across the width of the dwelling. It wraps around the side of the building to a maximum depth of 11.3m on the eastern side. The single storey element has a mono-pitched roof to the eastern side and a flat roof to the rear, with an eaves height of some 2.8m and a maximum height of 3.7m. Two windows are proposed in the rear elevation and a window and door opening in the flank elevation.
- 2.3 The first floor element projects some 3.7m from the rear wall of the dwelling on the eastern side over the ground floor extension. It would be some 3.5m in width. The first floor extension would have a hipped roof, with an eaves height of 5.4m and a maximum height of 6.9m. The eaves height matches that of the main dwelling. A single rear facing window is proposed.
- 2.4 The proposed materials include white render, tiles and white uPVC windows and doors to match the existing building.
- 2.5 The development would have one double bedroom, two single bedrooms, two bathrooms, lounge, kitchen and office at ground floor and three double bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor.
- 2.6 This application is for physical extensions to the building only. The applicant has stated that the use of the property would be unchanged and that it is currently used as use class C3(b) dwellinghouse, which covers up to six people living together as a single household and receiving care e.g. supported housing schemes such as those for people with learning disabilities or mental health problems. Presently 3 people live at the site and the maximum of number of people living at the address would be 6.

2.7 This application follows the refusal of planning application Ref: 19/00654/FULH described as "Erect part single/part two storey side and rear extension." The application was refused for the following reasons:

01. The proposal would by reason of its size, design mass and scale result in a contrived, incongruous, dominant and obtrusive form of development and out of keeping with and harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the rear garden scene to the detriment of visual amenity. This is unacceptable and contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies KP2 and CP4 of Core Strategy (2007), Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Document (2015) and advice contained within the Design and Townscape Guide (2009).

02. The proposed development by reason of its excessive depth and close proximity to habitable room windows would result in demonstrable harm to the amenity of the occupiers of No. 146 Carlton Avenue by way of loss of light and outlook and an increased sense of enclosure. This is unacceptable and contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) Core Strategy (2007) Policies KP2 and CP4, Development Management Document (2015) Policies DM1 and DM3 and the advice contained with the Design and Townscape Guide (2009).

The main differences between the proposed development and the refused scheme are:

- The total width of the proposed rear projection would be reduced in width.
- The single storey element of the refused scheme extended some 4m beyond the existing 3.1m rear projection *abutting the shared boundary* with No.146 resulting in total rear projection of some 7.1m from the existing rear wall of the dwelling.
- The proposed single storey would still project some 4m from the existing 3.1m rear projection *but the west facing side elevation would be set off the shared boundary by some 2.6m*
- The flat roof of the refused scheme contained a roof light. This is omitted from the proposed scheme.
- The refused scheme contained a double door opening in the rear elevation. The proposed scheme does not include a rear facing door opening.
- A door opening is included in the east facing flank elevation of the proposed scheme.

3 Relevant Planning History

3.1 90/0690 - Retain single storey rear extension. Granted

3.2 19/00654/FULH Erect part single/part two storey side and rear extension. Refused.

3.3 19/01225/FULH Erect part single/part two storey side and rear extension (Amended Proposal). Withdrawn.

4 Representation Summary

Environmental Health

4.1 No objection.

Essex Police

4.2 No objection.

Public Consultation

4.3 Councillor Garston has called the application in for consideration by the Development Control Committee.

4.4 Nine neighbouring properties were consulted and a site notice posted. One letter of representation has been received. The objections are summarised below.

- The proposed extensions will impact on the standard of living of neighbouring occupiers
- The plans are incorrect as a rear extension to a neighbouring property is shown as larger than the existing extension to the application property.
- Layout shown as existing is incorrect. The objection alleges that the “lounge” is used as a bedroom and the “diner” as a living room.
- The website of the applicant states the property is a home with 5 bedrooms
- Extensions would lead to a loss of privacy and overlooking to home and garden.
- Increased sense of enclosure, dominance and feeling of being hemmed in due to size and close proximity of extension.
- Loss of daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms on ground and first floor.
- Increase in noise levels due to expansion of existing house of multiple occupation for adults with learning disabilities and their carers since 2016.
- Extensions will double the capacity of the property up to 7 residents.
- Noise levels already high especially in the evening and at night which impacts on neighbour amenity.

These concerns are noted and they have been taken into account in the assessment of the application, however they are not found to represent a reasonable basis to refuse planning permission in the circumstances of the case.

5 Planning Policy Summary

5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019)

5.2 Core Strategy (2007), Policies KP1 (Spatial Strategy), KP2 (Development Principles), CP3 (Transport and Accessibility) and CP4 (Environment & Urban Renaissance)

5.3 Development Management Document (2015) Policies DM1 (Design Quality), DM3 (Efficient and Effective Use of Land) and DM15 (Sustainable Transport Management)

5.4 Design & Townscape Guide (2009)

5.5 CIL Charging Schedule (2015)

6 Planning Considerations

- 6.1 The main considerations in relation to this application are the principle of the development, design and impact on the character of the area, impact on residential amenity, traffic and transportation and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) contributions and whether the proposal overcomes the previous reasons for refusal.

7 Appraisal

Principle of Development

- 7.1 The proposal is considered in the context of the NPPF, Core Strategy, Policies KP1, KP2 and CP4 and Policy DM1 of the Development Management Document. 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. No change of use of the dwelling is proposed and it is located within a residential area where extensions and alterations to this property are considered acceptable in principle. Therefore, the principle of extending the dwelling is acceptable subject to the detailed design considerations below.

Design and Impact on the Character of the Area

- 7.2 The key element within all relevant policies is that good design should be a fundamental requirement of new development in order to achieve high quality living environments. Its importance is reflected in the NPPF, in Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Core Strategy and also in Policy DM1 of the Development Management Document. The Design and Townscape Guide also states that *“the Borough Council is committed to good design and will seek to create attractive, high-quality living environments.”*
- 7.3 Policy KP2 of the Core Strategy states new development should *“respect the character and scale of the existing neighbourhood where appropriate”*. Policy CP4 of the Core Strategy 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”*.
- 7.4 Policy DM1 of the Development Management Document 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”*.
- 7.5 Paragraph 348 of the Design and Townscape Guide also emphasises the importance of the design of rear extensions, regardless of whether there are any public views and any development should integrate well with the character of the main dwelling with particular regard to the scale, materials, fenestration detailing and form.
- 7.6 The proposed development would significantly increase the overall footprint of the existing dwelling. The property is a semi-detached dwelling and the proposal would extend the dwelling to the side and rear at ground floor, along with a two storey element to the rear. The extension at ground floor would add an additional 3.3m of built form to the rear of the dwelling, resulting in an extension of some 7.1m.

The existing rear extension is located on the shared boundary with No. 146 and the proposed single storey rear projection would be set some 2.6m off the shared boundary.

- 7.7 It is considered that the ground floor extension now proposed, on balance, would integrate acceptably with the dwelling house. Given its reduced width and setting away from the shared boundary, the ground floor extension is considered proportionate to the host dwelling achieving a scale which remains subservient to that of the main dwelling. In terms of its appearance, the use of external materials in the extension to match those of the existing dwelling would ensure that the development would appear unified with the existing dwelling. It is not considered that the proposed rear extension to the dwelling would cause material harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area.
- 7.8 The first floor element comprises of a hipped roof extension of some 3.7m deep and 3.5m wide, which is considered to be a large addition to the dwelling. The eaves height matches the existing eaves height of the main dwelling and the ridge would be set lower than the main ridge resulting in a subservient appearance. Given the use of matching materials, this element of the proposed development would in itself integrate satisfactorily with the main dwelling and the rear garden scene.
- 7.9 The proposed extensions are located towards the rear of the property. The side extension would be visible in oblique views from the streetscene. It would be set back some 10m from the main highway and views would be limited by the position of the neighbouring bungalow No. 142 and would not therefore result in material harm to the character and appearance of the wider streetscene.
- 7.10 On balance, it considered that the proposed development would result in an acceptable impact on the character and visual amenity of the dwelling itself and the wider area. The proposed development has therefore overcome the previous reason for refusal. The proposal is therefore acceptable and policy compliant in this regard.

Impact on Residential Amenity

- 7.11 The Design and Townscape Guide Paragraph 343; under the heading of Alterations and Additions to Existing Residential Buildings, states that amongst other criteria, 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'*. In addition to this Policy DM1 of the Development Management Document also states that development should *"Protect the amenity of the site, immediate neighbours, and surrounding area, having regard to privacy, overlooking, outlook, noise and disturbance, visual enclosure, pollution, and daylight and sunlight."*
- 7.12 The application dwelling is bounded by No. 146, the attached semi-detached (to the west) and No. 142 (to the east) Carlton Avenue. The adjacent neighbour No.142 is a detached bungalow, which is set back behind the established building line within Carlton Avenue and extends past the rear wall of No. 144. It also has an existing single storey rear extension some 4.5m deep. The proposed side extension is located approximately 1m from the shared boundary and would extend the full length of the western flank wall of No. 142. The first floor element is located some 3m from the shared boundary. There are no windows facing the shared boundary within No. 142 and a ground floor kitchen window is present in the flank elevation of No. 144.

Therefore, it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring occupiers to the east No.142 in terms of being overbearing, or creating undue dominance, loss of light or outlook or a material sense of enclosure.

- 7.13 The neighbouring property, No. 146 is the other half of the semi-detached pair and has an existing single storey rear extension some 2.5m in depth across the full width of the dwelling. The proposed extension would project some 4m in depth beyond the existing 3.1m deep rear extension resulting in a total projection of some 7.1m. The proposed single storey element would be set some 2.6m in from the shared boundary. There are main habitable windows facing rearward in the neighbours extension, with a central first floor window. Given that the proposed single storey extension is some 2.7m in height and would be set in some 2.6m from the shared boundary, on balance it is considered that the approximate 4.5m projection beyond the rear of No.146 would not result in a loss of light, outlook or perceived or actual levels of dominance or an undue sense of enclosure. The first floor element is located some 2.65m from the shared boundary and does not breach a nominal 45 degree line taken from the neighbours' first floor window. It is therefore considered that proposal has overcome the previous reason for refusal in this respect.
- 7.14 The development is therefore acceptable and policy compliant in the above regards.

Traffic and Transportation Issues

- 7.15 Policy DM15 of the Development Management Document requires dwellings with 2+ bedrooms to provide a minimum of two parking spaces.
- 7.16 The proposal would remove part of the existing driveway for parking. The remaining space would be some 10m in depth and this is considered to be of sufficient size to accommodate the required two parking spaces. No highways objections raised. Therefore the impact on traffic, transport and parking is considered to be acceptable and policy compliant in these regards.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) CIL Charging Schedule (2015)

- 7.17 The proposed extension equates to less than 100sqm of new floorspace as such the development benefits from a Minor Development Exemption under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and as such no charge is payable.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 Having taken all material planning considerations into account, it is found that subject to compliance with the attached conditions, the proposed development would, on balance, be acceptable and compliant with the objectives of the relevant development plan policies and guidance. The principle of the development is found to be acceptable and the proposal would, on balance have an acceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the character and appearance of the application site, and the surrounding area more widely. There are no adverse highways implications. The previous reason for refusal has been overcome and this application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

9 Recommendation

9.1 GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions.

01 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3528-03 Rev C & 3591-09 Rev A.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan.

03 All new work to the outside of the building must match existing original work in terms of the choice of materials, method of construction and finished appearance. This applies unless differences are shown on the drawings hereby approved or are required by conditions to this permission.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the appearance of the building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. This is as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Core Strategy (2007) Policies KP2 and CP4, Development Management Document (2015) Policy DM1, and the advice in the Design and Townscape Guide (2009).

04 The roof of the building/extension hereby approved shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area or for any other purpose unless express planning permission has previously been obtained. The roof can however be used for the purposes of maintenance or to escape in an emergency.

Reason: To protect the privacy and environment of people in neighbouring residential properties, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Core Strategy (2007), Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Document (2015) and the advice contained within the Design and Townscape Guide (2009).

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework. The detailed analysis is set out in a report on the application prepared by officers.

Informatives

- 01** 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.
- 02** You should be aware that in cases where damage occurs during construction works to the highway in implementing this permission that Council may seek to recover the cost of repairing public highways and footpaths from any party responsible for damaging them. This includes damage carried out when implementing a planning permission or other works to buildings or land. Please take care when carrying out works on or near the public highways and footpaths in the borough.
- 03** You are advised that this application relates to proposed extensions to the dwelling only. Any change of use from a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) could require separate planning permission.