

Reference:	21/01323/FULH
Application Type:	Full Application - Householder
Ward:	Thorpe
Proposal:	Erect part single/part two storey rear extension, raise part of ridge height, hip to gable roof extension to rear and form habitable accommodation in roof space, rooflights to side elevations, alter elevations and form porch canopy to front (Amended Proposal))
Address:	29 St Augustines Avenue, Thorpe Bay, Southend-on-Sea, SS1 3JH
Applicant:	G Steptoe
Agent:	Mr Colin Stone of Stone Me Ltd
Consultation Expiry:	30th July 2021
Expiry Date:	9th October 2021
Case Officer:	Kara Elliott
Plan Nos:	1947/01, 1947/02, 1947/03E, 1947/04E, 1947/05E, 1947/06E, 1947/07D
Recommendation:	GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions



1 Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The application site contains a large, traditional detached two-storey dwelling located on the west side of St Augustines Avenue. The area is residential in character with a mixture of two and single storey dwellings located in large plots with deep gardens.
- 1.2 The site is not located within a conservation area nor is subject to any site-specific planning policies.

2 The Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission to erect a part single/part two-storey rear extension, to raise part of the ridge height, to erect a hip to gable roof extension to the rear to form habitable accommodation in the loftspace and to alter the elevations. The application follows two previous refusals of planning permission. The first application 21/00066/FULH proposed a similar development but had a larger single storey rear extension and a pitched roof dormer to the front with a large triangular window and a pitched roof, gable-fronted two storey front projection with second floor window.
- 2.2 The most recent refusal ref 21/00695/FULH proposed development similar to the former but the proposed pitched roof dormer to the front was to be a blind dormer, the two storey gable fronted projection was omitted and the single storey rear extension was reduced in size.
- 2.3 The originally refused development would have resulted in the dwelling finished in stone cladding at ground floor, black timber/timber effect horizontal cladding and render to first floor, with a grey tiled (slate or concrete) roof. The second application proposed materials which are also proposed in this current application; clay roof tiles, cream painted render and grey windows.
- 2.4 The changes to the current scheme from the last refused scheme are a reduction in height of the two-storey gable-end rear projection from 8.75m high to 8.25m high (0.5m lower) and the omission of the blind dormer to the front elevation. A lead or zinc metal door canopy proposed in the former application has been replaced in the current scheme with a hipped roof canopy supported by a timber column which would measure 3.2m high and provide a covered open porch to the main entrance to the dwelling.
- 2.5 The proposed single-storey rear extension would be 5.8m deep, 3m high and 9.8m wide, set some 1.2m from the southern flank elevation.
- 2.6 The two-storey part of the rear extension would involve the rear hip to gable roof extension and would have a depth of 3.6m and a width of 7m, as previously proposed. This large, pitched roof rear projection would contain a large expanse of glazing within its eaves providing a first floor Juliet balcony and a second floor window (formerly proposed as a Juliet balcony). The dwelling would also be squared-off at the rear of the first floor level.
- 2.7 The ridge height would be enlarged to form a consistent roof height of 8.9m to reach the existing maximum height. This is as per the previously refused schemes.

3 Relevant Planning History

3.1 21/00067/CLP - Erect outbuilding at rear (Lawful Development Certificate-Proposed) – Lawful 11.03.2021;

3.2 21/00066/FULH - Erect part single/part two storey rear extension, raise part of ridge height, hip to gable roof extension to rear and dormer to front to form habitable accommodation in the loftspace, alter elevations – Refused 16.03.2021. The reasons for refusal were as follows;

- 1. The proposed development by reason of scale, bulky appearance, design and use of materials, fails to integrate with the existing dwelling or respect the context of the site in relation to the wider area. As a result, the proposal would appear as an unduly prominent and discordant building, out of keeping with adjacent dwellings and the wider the streetscene.*
- 2. The proposed cumulative impacts of the rear extensions would result in demonstrable harm to the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of No. 27 Augustines Avenue, by way of an increased sense of enclosure and overbearing impact.*

3.3 21/00695/FULH - Erect part single/part two storey rear extension, raise part of ridge height, hip to gable roof extension to rear and dormer to front to form habitable accommodation in the loftspace, alter elevations (Amended Proposal) – Refused 08.06.2021. The sole reason for refusal in the most recent application as the neighbour amenity issues were resolved was as follows;

- 1. The proposed development by reason of scale, bulky appearance and design fails to integrate with the existing dwelling or respect the context of the site in relation to the wider area. As a result the proposal would appear as an unduly prominent and discordant building, out of keeping with adjacent dwellings and the wider streetscene.*

3.4 The previous applications are material planning considerations for the determination of the current proposal. The latest refused application, given the greater degree of similarity with the current application, is a consideration of significant weight.

4 Representation Summary

4.1 The application falls to be decided by members of the Development Control Committee at the request of Councillor R Woodley. Cllr Woodley advised that; *“Proposal not too dissimilar to the previous applications and although improved on its impact and appearance this current application is however still unfavourable. It still protrudes quite far out the back by comparison to the existing property, and although would have less of an impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impacts, it will still have that impact.”*

Public Consultation

4.2 15 neighbours were notified. Representations from two interested parties have been received which raise the following summarised objections;

- Loss of neighbour amenity from loss of outlook, overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of light;
- Out of character/poor design;
- Excessive size and scale;
- Dominant and imposing;
- Overdevelopment of site.

4.3 Officer comment: The comments in the representations have been taken into consideration in the assessment of the application but are not found to be justifiable reasons for refusing planning permission in the circumstances of this case.

5 Planning Policy Summary

5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)

5.2 Core Strategy (2007): Policies CP4 (Environment and Urban Renaissance) and KP2 (Development Principles)

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

5.4 The Design & Townscape Guide (2009)

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

6 Planning Considerations

6.1 The key considerations in relation to this application are the principle of the development, design and impact on the character of the area, impacts on residential amenity and whether the proposal has overcome the previous reason for refusal.

6.2 Due to the nature of the development, in which the need for, and provision of, on-site parking capable of meeting current parking standards and the access arrangements of the site are not altered, there are no adverse highway safety or parking impacts. It should be noted that the existing garage is undersized when assessed against relevant parking standards and therefore not considered an off-street parking space. Given the size of the proposal, it would not be liable to CIL.

7 Appraisal

Principle of Development

7.1 Consistent with the basis of decision on the previous applications, the principle of extending the dwelling to provide facilities in association with residential accommodation is considered acceptable. Other material planning considerations are discussed below.

Design and Impact on the Character of the Area

- 7.2 Good design is a fundamental requirement of new development 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 Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that, *“The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.”*
- 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 Policy DM3 (5) also advises that; *‘Alterations and additions to a building will be expected to make a positive contribution to the character of the original building and the surrounding area through:*
- (i) The use of materials and detailing that draws reference from, and where appropriate enhances, the original building, and ensures successful integration with it; and*
 - (ii) Adopting a scale that is respectful and subservient to that of the original building and surrounding area; and*
 - (iii) Where alternative materials and detailing to those of the prevailing character of the area are proposed, the Council will look favourably upon proposals that demonstrate high levels of innovative and sustainable design that positively enhances the character of the original building or surrounding area.’*
- 7.6 According to Policy KP2 of Core Strategy 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”*
- 7.7 The application site is set within a residential area which is host to a distinctive character of large, traditional, hipped and crown roof dwellings of one and two storeys. Accommodation at second floor is not considered to be part of the prevailing typical character of the streetscene. The current revised scheme has completely omitted the front second storey openings and roof additions, including the previously proposed blind dormer. These successfully reduce the visual bulk of the proposed dwelling as experienced from the streetscene. The resulting dwelling would continue to be read as a two-storey dwelling, in contrast to the previously refused schemes which had a three-storey appearance. First floor front windows have also been reduced in size which is welcomed.

- 7.8 A zinc metal canopy over the front door within the previous application was considered to result in poor design and has now been replaced with a traditional hipped roof canopy on a timber column which is in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would overcome the previously outlined harm. The overall use of materials more commonly seen within the streetscene is a benefit of the proposed development.
- 7.9 The rear elements of the proposed development would result in a two-storey rear projection half a metre below the previously refused scheme and stepped in from the flanks of the dwelling which would reduce its visual bulk. The single-storey rear projection has the same dimensions as the previous application. When determining that scheme no objection was raised in terms of the design of this element of the proposal which had been reduced in size when compared to the original scheme.
- 7.10 Overall, it is considered that the development has overcome the previous reason for refusal due to the omission of the front dormer, the reduction of the rear two storey projection, the traditional porch canopy and the alterations to fenestration.
- 7.11 The development would not result in demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling, the streetscene or the wider surrounding area. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would be acceptable and policy compliant in the above regards.

Impact on Residential Amenity

- 7.12 Paragraph 343 of the Design and Townscape Guide under the heading of 'Alterations and Additions to Existing Residential Buildings' 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."*
- 7.13 The most recent refusal did not raise any concern with regard to the proposed development's impact on neighbours' amenity. The site is neighboured by no.27 to the south which is some 1.5m from the shared boundary with the application site. There are no flank openings opposite the site at no.27. The existing rearmost building line of the application site is set in-line with that of no.27. The proposed infill extension at the rear above the existing single-storey, flat roof part of the dwelling, would not surpass the rearmost building line of the existing dwelling.
- 7.14 The depth and separation distance (1.2m at ground floor and at least 2.4m at upper floors from the southern boundary of the site) of the proposed rear extensions from no.27, coupled with the height reduction of this part of the scheme from the previous application, would result in an acceptable relationship with this neighbour. A notional 45-degree guideline taken from the nearest rear first floor window at no.27 would not be breached by the proposal. The proposed development would not result in significant harm to the residential amenity of the occupiers of no.27.
- 7.15 The site is also neighboured by no.31 to the north. The main dwelling on that address is some 5.4m from the shared boundary with the application site and some 6m from the flank elevation of the dwelling on site. There is also a garage between that dwelling and the site. There are no flank openings opposite the site at no.31. The proposal would project some 1.5m beyond the existing notional rear building line of no.31. The rear extensions would be 1.2m at ground floor and 3.2m at upper floors level away

from this boundary. A notional 45-degree guideline taken from the nearest rear first floor window at no.31 would not be breached by the proposal. Due to scale, position and separation distances from no.31, the proposed development would not result in significant harm to the residential amenity of occupiers at no.31.

- 7.16 The proposed large openings to the first and second floors of the rear of the dwelling with a Juliet balcony at first floor are not considered to be positive elements of the scheme and would result in a degree of perceived overlooking when standing in the rear gardens of no.27 and 31 but this would not be to a degree which would justify a reason for refusal on this basis. This is consistent with the basis of decision of the previous two applications. Views from the windows of the large rear openings to the rear of properties along Parkanaur Road, due to the distances involved (approximately 47 metres) would not result in a significant loss of privacy or overlooking concerns. First floor flank openings would serve non-habitable rooms (bathrooms) and the secondary bedroom window at first floor to the southern flank is as per the existing situation. A condition to require obscure glazing for these windows is suggested. The proposed rooflights due to their nature and position would not result in a detrimental loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers with the conditions recommended.
- 7.17 The proposal's impact on residential amenity is therefore acceptable and policy compliant.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 Having taken all material planning considerations into account, it is found that the development would be acceptable and in line with the objectives of the relevant local and national policies and guidance. The development, subject to conditions, would result in acceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenity and the character and appearance of the area. This application therefore overcomes the previous reason for refusal and is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

9 Recommendation

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

- 01 The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: 1947/01, 1947/02, 1947/03E, 1947/04E, 1947/05E, 1947/06E, 1947/07D.**
- Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with 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 or be in accordance with approved details and plan 1947/03E. 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 (2021), Core Strategy (2007) Policies KP2 and CP4, Development Management Document (2015) Policy DM1, and the Design and Townscape Guide (2009).

- 04** The roof of the single storey rear extension hereby approved shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area or for any other similar 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 (2021), Core Strategy (2007) Policy CP4, Development Management Document (2015) Policy DM1, and the advice contained within the Design and Townscape Guide (2009).

- 05** The upper floor flank (north and south elevations) windows and rooflights hereby approved shall only be glazed permanently in obscure glass (the glass to be obscure to at least Level 4 on the Pilkington Levels of Privacy, or such equivalent as may be agreed in writing with the local planning authority) and permanently fixed shut to a minimum of 1.7 metres above the internal finished floor level of the rooms they serve prior to the first use or occupation of the development hereby approved. In the case of multiple or double glazed units at least one layer of glass in the relevant units shall be glazed in obscure glass to at least Level 4. The windows and rooflights shall be retained as such in perpetuity thereafter.

Reason: To protect the privacy and environment of people in neighbouring residential properties, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Core Strategy (2007) policy CP4, Development Management Document (2015) policy DM1 and the advice in the Design and Townscape Guide (2009).

Positive and Proactive Statement

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.

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.

- 2. 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.**