

SITE PLAN ATTACHED

06. ATTE BOWER FIRSGROVE ROAD WARLEY ESSEX CM14 5JJ

HIP TO GABLE ROOF WITH REAR DORMER, RAISING THE EXISTING ROOF BY 750MM, LIFTING EAVES HEIGHT TO DROP OVERALL HEIGHT OF ROOF, AND TWO ROOF LIGHTS.

APPLICATION NO: 16/00380/FUL

WARD	Brentwood West	8/13 WEEK DATE	29.04.2016
PARISH		POLICIES	NPPF NPPG CP1 H17
CASE OFFICER	Ms Sukhi Dhadwar	01277 312500	
Drawing no(s) relevant to this decision:	D8080/PA/02c; D8080/PA/01a; D8080/PA/03a;		

This application was referred by Cllr Russell for consideration by the Committee.
The reason(s) are as follows:

The roof design and dormer are acceptable and do not impact on the streetscene or design of this inter war property. In addition it is neighboured by larger properties so will not be overbearing. Ridge height has been reduced from previous application. Complies with CP1 of the Local Plan.

1. Proposals

Permission is sought for hip to gable roof extensions, to raise the height of the roof by 750mm and a dormer extension on the rear roof slope. Two roof lights are also proposed to the front roof slope.

The hip to gable roof extensions will extend the ridge line to each side of the apex.

The proposed rear dormer measures a maximum 4.8 and project 3.58m from the ride.

Materials proposed include black weatherboarding for the walls of the dormer and side elevation of gable roof, roof tiles to match existing and black framed upvc fenestration.

2. Policy Context

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)

Chapter 7: (Requiring Good Design) requires new development to be of high design and be design that promotes or reinforces local distinctiveness.

The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides additional guidance which supports the National Planning Policy Framework.

Brentwood Replacement Local Plan

CP1 (General Development Criteria) expects new development to be in scale with the existing dwelling and respect the character and appearance of the area.

H17 (Dormer Windows) Dormers should be subsidiary rather than dominant feature of the roof, be set in from any wall of the property and be below the ridge height.

3. Relevant History

- 15/01194/FUL: Hip to gable roof with dormer to rear, raise existing roof by 1m and two rooflights to front. -Application Refused

4. Neighbour Responses

No representations received.

5. Consultation Responses

- **Design Officer:**

I do not support the proposals as being of Good Design; the roof in particular is of fundamental concern and should be reconsidered. I have not been part of any preapplication discussions but would be pleased to advise on any amendments submitted.

6. Summary of Issues

The issues relevant to the determination of this application are:

The impact the proposal will have on the character and appearance of the application house and surrounding area and,

The impact of the proposal will have on the living conditions of neighbouring residential properties.

Site and surroundings

The proposal site comprises a detached interwar house with attached garage on the northern side of Firsgrove Road. The house is set forward of the neighbouring property No. 7 Firsgrove Road but broadly shares a front building line with the adjacent flats at Copeland House Firsgrove Road.

The properties on the opposite side of the road are a mixture of late Victorian and turn of the 20th Century semi detached and terraced houses.

Background

The grounds of refusal for the previous application (reference 15/01194/FUL for a hip to gable roof extension with rear dormer, raising the existing roof by 1m, lifting eaves height to drop overall height of the roof and two roof lights) were:-

"The proposed alterations and extensions to the existing roof by virtue of their height, bulk and prominent position visible from the public realm will be out of scale and poorly related to the design and height of the application property, resulting in a dominant and incongruous feature which will undermine the distinctive local character and appearance of the site and surrounding area contrary to chapter 7 of the NPPF and local policy contained within CP1 (i) and (iii) of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan."

This current application seeks to address those concerns by reducing the height of the ridge extension by 250mm (25cm) in comparison to the refused scheme, which is considered to be 'de minimus' amount.

Impact on character and appearance :

The existing property is a well proportioned two storey dwelling with pyramid design roof plan and a modest roof pitch.

The effect of the proposed extensions would be to completely alter the design, bulk and massing of the building, increasing the height so that the overall form would appear dominant and out of scale with the house. It is noted that No. 7 Firsgrove Road is higher than what is proposed here, but that property is of a different design and in any event is set back from the highway and less prominent in the street scene. However it is the combination of all the extensions that would give rise to a bulk and massing that would be materially harmful to the existing dwelling and therefore in turn be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

Furthermore, the rear dormer would dominate the rear roof slope rather than being a subsidiary feature.

This would be in conflict with both National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to reinforce good design and local plan Policy CP1 which requires new extensions to be of a high standard of design and not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and Policy H17.

Impact on neighbouring amenity.

There is no increase in the footprint of the building and neighbouring residential properties are sufficiently distant to ensure that they will not be materially affected in terms of light, outlook or privacy.

Fallback position:

Government legislation allows most householders to undertake certain types of development without the need for specific consent from the local planning authority (permitted development). These types of development can be a material consideration when considering proposals required for full planning permission. In this instance, the raising of the roof would not be within the limitations of 'permitted development', and it is considered that the combination of the increase in height and all the other extensions that would make this proposal an unacceptable form of development, and therefore outweigh any fallback position.

In conclusion, the recommendation for refusal remains unchanged since the previous application, and the revisions to the scheme are not considered significant enough to be able to overcome the harm that the development would have on the character and appearance of the existing house and wider area, in conflict with Local Plan Policy and National Planning Policy.

7. Recommendation

The Application be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

R1 U12945

The proposed alterations and extensions to the roof by virtue of their height, bulk and massing would be out of scale and poorly related to the design and height of the application property, resulting in a dominant and incongruous development which would in turn be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. This would be conflict with Local Plan Policy CP1 (i) and (iii) and the aims and objective of the National Planning Policy Framework.

R2 U12946

The proposed dormer would be a dominant feature and poorly related to the roofscape into which it is to be inserted, harmful to the character and appearance of the area and in conflict with Local Plan Policy H17 and contrary to one of the principle objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative(s)

1 INF25

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 Local Planning Authority is willing to meet with the Applicant 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.

2 INF05

The following development plan policies contained in the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 are relevant to this decision: CP1. H17 the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and NPPG 2014.

3 INF20

The drawing numbers listed above are relevant to this decision

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

DECIDED: